

WISCONSIN

William H. Meyer to be postmaster at Cecil, Wis., in place of L. K. Herning. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1939.

Alex W. Quade to be postmaster at Jackson, Wis., in place of M. G. Gumm, removed.

Charles J. McAfee to be postmaster at Montello, Wis., in place of C. J. McAfee. Incumbent's commission expired July 30, 1939.

Byron A. Delaney to be postmaster at Reedsville, Wis., in place of F. J. Kugle, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 4 (legislative day of September 18), 1940

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Ingram M. Stainback to be United States district judge for the district of Hawaii.

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Edna A. Bauser, Bunker Hill.

Winifred J. Ranger, North Aurora.

PENNSYLVANIA

H. Leon Breidenbach, Boyertown.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our Lord, we thank Thee for life. Its highest reach is very simple and very grand. It declares the practice of a greatly gracious soul, seeking to be good and to do good, in magnificent daring for the sake of others. We pray Thee to endow us richly with the immortal graces of love and gratitude. Give wisdom that we may know how to use authority and discretion that the use of power may be restrained. Impress us that problems and difficulties should always yield to one solution and that is, a high sense of right. Almighty God, we love our country. What thoughts can exhaust our wonder, what words can express our gratitude for the countless numbers who have died for us. We break our alabasters of thanksgiving upon the memories of those who have made possible our Christian institutions. We pray that we may ever firmly resolve that we would rather die than to live in a world ground down by falsehood and brutality. Let the divine voice call out from the breast of humanity, pursuing all tyrannies to their lowest depths until they reach the margin of the world. In the name of our ever-living Saviour—the Man of Nazareth. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10412. An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 960) entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 10094) entitled "An act to require the registration of certain organizations carrying on activities within the United States, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon,

and appoints Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BURKE, and Mr. DANAHER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 4341. An act to expedite national defense by suspending, during the national emergency, provisions of law that prohibit more than 8 hours' labor in any 1 day of persons engaged upon work covered by contracts of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 5 to the bill (H. R. 10464) entitled "An act to assist in the national-defense program by amending sections 3477 and 3737 of the Revised Statutes to permit the assignment of claims under public contract."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4107) entitled "An act to transfer the jurisdiction of the Arlington Farm, Virginia, to the jurisdictions of the War Department and the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. MINTON, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. GURNEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2103) entitled "An act to exempt certain Indians and Indian tribes from the provisions of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), as amended," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. WHEELER, and Mr. FRAZIER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

LETTER FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE TRANSMITTING MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, which was read:

OCTOBER 4, 1940.

The SPEAKER,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Pursuant to the special order agreed to on October 3, 1940, the Clerk of the House received on that day the following message from the Senate:

That the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, the bill (H. R. 10539) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the afore-mentioned bill; requests a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints Mr. ADAMS, Mr. GLASS, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BYRNES, Mr. HALE, and Mr. TOWNSEND conferees on the part of the Senate.

Respectfully yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.
By H. NEWLIN MEGILL.

FOREIGN SHIPMENTS BY THE DU PONTS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, on September 24, I placed in the RECORD an article by Mr. Guy Richards, New York correspondent of the Chicago Tribune press service, and made some comments thereon.

The article charged that foreign agents in the Du Pont Powder Co. offices "guide war goods to Axis" to the extent of \$10,000,000 monthly, and reads in part as follows:

AGENTS IN DU PONT OFFICES GUIDE WAR GOODS TO AXIS—UNITED STATES TRADE WITH GERMANY, ITALY PUT AT \$10,000,000 MONTHLY

(By Guy Richards)

NEW YORK, September 23.—Despite the British blockade, American industrialists have found corkscrew routes for pouring into

Germany and Italy about \$10,000,000 worth of vital war materials every month.

Vast stores of oil, copper, machinery, and cotton are finding their way to Axis territory through Arctic Ocean ports, Spain, Portugal, Cuba, Mexico, and Russia.

BACKED BY BIG BUSINESS

At least five nations are lending their services to American businessmen who have found gold-lined routes for shipping blockade-barrered goods into Germany.

These scattered suppliers, dealing through their New York headquarters, have established contacts with agents all over the world. The agents are sponsored in this country by amazingly influential business interests.

It was learned, for example, that the American representative of Juan March, financial backer of General Franco, Spanish dictator, has his desk in the offices of Francis I. du Pont Co., at 1 Wall Street. He receives a regular salary from the firm, which is engaged in the commodity and brokerage business.

BRANCH IN WILMINGTON

Three members of the famous Wilmington (Del.) clan that controls E. I. du Pont de Nemours are partners in this Wall Street firm, which also has a branch in Wilmington. The interest of its senior member, Francis I. du Pont, is secured with 2,000 shares of Hercules Powder common stock—an investment which was forced out of direct Du Pont control by a Sherman antitrust suit of 1912.

Another desk in the Francis I. du Pont office is occupied by Avelino Montes, Jr., the man whom German firms here know as the expert on how to get shipments through Mexico.

The two men—Jose M. Mayorga, Spanish emissary of Franco's Juan March, and Mexico's Avelino Montes—sit side by side in a comfortable suite in the Du Pont offices, on the ninth floor of the building. They are intimate friends and former classmates at the Harvard Business School. By manufacturers anxious to obtain deliveries in Germany they are known as exactly the right people to see.

Yesterday I received a telegram from W. S. Carpenter, Jr., president of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., taking exceptions to the article and my reference thereto which might indicate that the Du Ponts are being taken advantage of. Regardless of how much I may disagree with a person or an organization, my policy has always been to try to be fair. Therefore, I feel honor bound to give the Du Pont viewpoint the same publicity in the RECORD that I accorded to the article of the Chicago Tribune correspondent. I ask unanimous consent to present it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I may say that it was given out last year that less than 3 percent of the volume of the Du Pont's business comprised war munitions, so that the people have the wrong idea with reference to the Du Ponts manufacturing and exportation of materials of war.

Mr. SABATH. I do not represent them; nevertheless, in justice to them, I feel they are entitled to have this telegram in the RECORD.

Mr. RICH. That is the reason I make the statement. It is in justice to the Du Ponts. I do not own any Du Pont stock. I wish I did.

Mr. SABATH. Neither do I.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. The telegram reads as follows:

WILMINGTON, DEL., October 2, 1940.

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House of Representatives:

My attention was called only today to address you made in House of Representatives September 24 and news article on which you premised your statement. As president of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., I deny categorically all allegations with reference to this company. Reports to which you give credence that "the Du Ponts and their affiliates are monthly exporting \$10,000,000 worth of war munitions that finally reach aggressor nations" are wholly untrue. Factually this company has made no munitions shipments whatsoever to any Axis Power directly or indirectly. Because of your interest permit me to advise you regarding our export sales of military powers. From 1933 through 1938 total gross export sales by this company amounted to \$895,912. For same period Remington Arms, only affiliate of this company making military products, had gross sales from export of \$2,044,634. In 1939 our gross sales from export totaled \$475,964 and for Remington for same year \$123,068, a combined monthly average of \$49,919. For first 8 months of current year our gross sales from export amounted to \$1,179,205, with bulk of these sales to Great Britain, China, Finland, and France. Remington sales for same 8 months, \$1,341,856, mostly to

Great Britain and France. Monthly average for both companies in this period is only \$315,133. Not one pound of munitions has been sold by this company or Remington to Germany, Italy, or Japan. Nor do we have any reason to suspect that one pound eventually reaches the Axis Powers. How preposterous the charge we are exporting \$10,000,000 worth munitions monthly that finally reach aggressor nations. We cannot but feel keenly when we read such unfounded allegations at a time when we are placing our facilities, our understanding in manufacture, our perseverance and determination to do everything that may be expected of us in serving this Nation and true democracy. I have every confidence foregoing will convince you grave injustice has been done Du Pont and American industry, and that in the interest of truth and accuracy you will want to read this telegram to the House and place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

W. S. CARPENTER, JR.,
President, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Mr. SABATH. It will be noted that Mr. Carpenter does not answer many of the specific statements made by Mr. Richards, whose article appeared in various newspapers. It may be that the good intentions of the Du Pont firm have unsuspectingly been taken advantage of.

In any event, I have placed Mr. Carpenter's telegram in the RECORD, as he requested, and no doubt Mr. Richards, of the Chicago Tribune Press Service, will want to express his further views on the subject.

SIDNEY HILLMAN

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROUTZOHN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago Mr. Sidney Hillman, labor member of the National Defense Advisory Commission, asked the Attorney General of the United States for an opinion or a ruling that companies adjudged by the Labor Board to be in violation of the National Labor Relations Act should be barred from Government contracts.

In one of his justly famous messages the Attorney General has given the ruling required of him.

Even this pliable Attorney General could find no basis in law for this contribution to confusion. In fact, Congress refused to pass such a law last year and the year before. The Attorney General's informal opinion cited no law, no statute, no court decisions.

His message is a masterpiece of the kind of short-cut reasoning with which the National Socialists have confused logical and sensible people in giving to their lawless acts the disguise of legality.

Thus, without sanction of law, does he seek to turn our national-defense production over to the whims of this intriguing, Communist-infested agency of the administration, an agency that the record shows has gone out of its way to sabotage industry and create national disunity.

Now, I ask, What does this mean? What is really behind it? Is it just a slick political trick on the eve of election to make it appear that the workers and the management are quarreling, to throw them into apparent opposition upon a question manufactured for the purpose, in irresponsible disregard of the effect upon national defense and national unity? Or is it another of those overclever flank moves of the left-wingers toward national socialism and the political ownership of property?

Is it, in fact, the first move toward the confiscation of property under the cloak of national defense, using the argument that the unlawful acts of the management, as found by the Labor Board and the "yes, sir" Attorney General, make it necessary for the political tools to take over the plant?

Let us get this out in the open right now.

If we are going to do this thing, if we are going to bar the Government from contracting with producers who fall into disfavor with a Government agency, then let us do it honestly by law and not by a curbstone opinion of a pliable dispenser of easy short cuts around the law.

And let us not confine this to the Labor Board. Let us be consistent and say that any person who is in conflict with or who has been found in violation of any ruling by any

Government agency shall be barred from Government contracts and participation in the national defense.

Why single out the Labor Board, which the record shows to be the most unreliable of all the Government agencies? If it is a sound principle in law, let us make it apply to all agencies of the Government. [Applause.]

My friend Judge Cox, of Georgia, hands me a list of companies who would be barred from participation in national defense, because they have pending appeals from National Labor Relations Board orders:

General Motors Corporation.
Swift & Co.
Phelps Dodge Corporation.
Wilson & Co.
John A. Roebling Sons Co.
Colorado Fuel & Iron Corporation.
Dow Chemical Co.
H. A. Heintz Co.
Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co.
Automotive Maintenance & Machinery Co.
Bethlehem Steel Co.
Vincennes Steel Co.
Alloy Cast Steel Co.
John Deere Tractor Co., Inc.
Owens-Illinois Glass Co.
E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co.
Ford Motor Co.
National Cash Register Co.
Combustion Engineering Co.
Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc.
United States Pipe & Foundry Co.
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.
Standard Oil of Indiana.
The Texas Co.
The Nevada Consolidated Copper Corporation.
Phillips Petroleum Co.
P. Lorillard Co.
Valley Steel Products Co.
Maltrup Steel Products Co.
Florence Pipe Foundry & Machine Co.
Lincoln Engineering Co.
Solvay Process Co.
Illinois Tool Works.
McQuay-Norris Manufacturing Co.
Mathieson Alkali Works.
International Shoe Co.
Kirkham Engineering & Manufacturing Co.
Marlin-Rockwell Corporation.
Todd Shipyards Corporation.
Robins Drydock & Repair Corporation.
Acme Air Appliance Co., Inc.
Radburn Motors Co.
Chicago Apparatus Co.
Stornar Manufacturing Co.
Dain Manufacturing Co.
Arma Engineering Co.
Washougha Woolen Mills.
Windsor Manufacturing Co.
Bloomfield Manufacturing Co.

This shows how the National Labor Relations Board is being used to sabotage our national defenses and scuttle private industry.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

HOUSING IN CONNECTION WITH NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 10412) to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Mr. LANHAM, Mr. CROWE, and Mr. HOLMES.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a letter addressed to the editor of the New York Times on September 15.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan and Mr. CUMMINGS asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the Record.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a radio address I delivered last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I see that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART] is on the floor, and I rise to ask him one question. Last winter there was a question of a fifth Federal judgeship in the State of New Jersey. I objected to it and said I did not think it was necessary. Up to now this fifth Federal judge has not been appointed. I wonder how come, if it was so necessary.

Mr. HART. I may say in reply to the gentleman from New Jersey that he will have to seek the information in some other quarter.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Monday, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

PEACE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today at the conclusion of the legislative program I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on the subject of peace.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Minnesota desire to proceed at this time?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, peace is still the desire of an overwhelming majority of the American people; but while billions of dollars have been appropriated out of necessity to prepare for war, should it be forced upon us, no special funds have been appropriated to prepare for peace.

From a realistic viewpoint we know that we get what we prepare for. Is it not true?

If there is no adequate study and preparation for a just and lasting peace, we will never, never find such a peace, whether we go into or stay out of this war, whether we arm to the teeth or slide along. Peace, like anything else, must be prepared, must be purchased at a price.

That price is very low and very reasonable as compared to the costs of war. I have just asked the House Appropriations Committee what we have authorized and appropriated this year for war. The answer: Approximately \$17,000,000,000.

I have today introduced a resolution asking for a very small appropriation, comparatively speaking, to be used to "prepare for peace." I am asking that we set aside only \$50,000,000, and I hope speedy and favorable action will be taken on this very fundamental request.

My resolution is as follows:

PREPARE FOR PEACE

Whereas the Seventy-sixth Congress has appropriated or authorized about \$17,000,000,000 for military preparedness; and

Whereas an important national election is now impending, when all peace-loving citizens will justly challenge on their record their former representatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Congress promptly prove that we are not limiting preparation for defense to military means only, but are also attempting to prepare for defense and security by nonmilitary means, such as bona fide efforts for peace; and to this end be it further

Resolved, That the President be, and he hereby is, instructed to take immediate joint action with all possible like-minded governments of nations not at war in offering their services openly and publicly to the belligerents in the cause of peace; and be it further

Resolved, That in order to satisfy the longing for peace of all the peoples of the world a cessation of all hostilities under joint neutral supervision should be openly demanded, and at the same time the actual extension of the system of federation into a world union of nations should be offered and pledged to the belligerents by the joint neutrals as the only practical means of readjusting the status of newly conquered nations or long-held colonies and dominions, of under-privileged or over-privileged states, and permitting mankind to build a new and better civilization in safety, without fear of war and organized destruction: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in order to finance the above-described program of joint neutral efforts for the present and future of the world, the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring) hereby appropriates \$50,000,000 as our safest and least costly defense.

This is made especially desirable and needful by reason of the recent alliance agreement of the axis powers, which makes Japan, Italy, and Germany into a powerful military alliance.

PACIFIC PROBLEMS

The outcome of the axis struggle for power is a very important matter because it presents to us a two-ocean peril. Manifestly it would be folly for the United States not to prepare in every way for the possible eventuality of a German-Italian victory, sudden or gradual.

I wonder if it is generally recognized that the peril in which we would then be placed extends to two oceans? Japan's position would be greatly enhanced by the inevitable weakening of British as well as the collapse of the French power and prestige in the Orient—exactly as I pointed out in my address in the House on February 22, 1939, entitled "Is Democracy in Guam?"

DIVISION OF AMERICAN SEA POWER

This would be accompanied in the United States by an immediate logical demand that a large part of the American Navy be transferred from the Pacific to the Atlantic. American naval forces would then be extended along two vast ocean fronts—responsible for the protection of two continents on both the east and the west. They would be faced by a combined sea power greater than their own, backed by superior shipbuilding facilities.

The Atlantic, inadequately defended except along our own coast line and in the Caribbean, might then be circumvented as was the Maginot line. In the Pacific the withdrawal of a large part of the American Navy would promptly remove the chief remaining obstacle to Japanese expansion, by stages, over Shanghai, Hong Kong, Indochina, the Dutch East Indies, Singapore, Australia, New Zealand, and eventually the Philippines. Successive steps in such a program, clearly contemplated by Japanese leaders, would reinvigorate Japan's morale, strengthen her position against China, provide needed sources of vital supplies, and make untenable the position of Burma and India. Thus, Asia, with one-half of the world's population, would come, like Europe, under the domination of an aggressive dictatorship.

Germany, to be sure, would probably seek to keep Japan within bounds in order to obtain as large a share in the expansion—especially at Singapore and the Dutch East Indies—as possible, and to maintain for herself a position of dominance in German-Japanese relations. This may account for current reports of friction between the two countries. But Hitler has shown his capacity, in dealing with Russia, to make sweeping, if temporary, compromises in order to concentrate his energies elsewhere. Japan's continued expansion, moreover, would offer a means toward checking further resistance from outlying parts of the British Empire; it would, at the same time, strengthen a potential ally against the United States. So long as the United States remained the chief obstacle to the revolutionary ambitions of both nations, it is as dangerous to assume that their realistic

negotiators would be unable to get together as it was for the British to rely upon irreconcilable friction between Germany and Russia.

The United States, with its vast commitments in this hemisphere, would then be exposed to a gigantic squeeze play, with Germany and Italy dominating Europe and Africa on the one side and Japan largely dominating eastern Asia and the southern Pacific on the other. Under such circumstances the positions of Russia and the United States would be increasingly critical.

The question is thus whether we should not move, if we can do so swiftly and effectively, to prevent such a world-wide alignment of militant dictatorships against us. For clearly we are not prepared for an emergency of such magnitude, and it seems to me that the best way out is a move for a peace organization such as is suggested in the above resolution.

HIGH COST OF WAR

It cost about 75 cents to kill a man in Caesar's time. The price rose to about \$3,000 per man during the Napoleonic wars, to \$5,000 in our Civil War, and then to \$21,000 per man in the World War. But estimates for the present war indicate that it may cost the warring nations not less than \$50,000 for each man killed. In other words, shall we appropriate what it costs to kill 1,000 men and thus save millions of men, women, and children? At the price set in my resolution of \$50,000,000 for a program to promote peace, if it were used for war, it would kill only 1,000 at present rates, but it might save millions, if spent for peace. [Applause.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who just preceded me gave a very interesting talk and one that it seems to me should receive more consideration from the House of Representatives. And I shall extemporaneously comment on things pertaining to the subject of war, and so forth.

This country at this time, in my judgment, is in a very precarious condition. We as a Congress are going ahead with these great appropriations and preparation for war and if we continue as we have been doing for the last 30 days, I venture the assertion that within 6 months we will actually be in war, and nothing more detrimental could happen to the American Nation, American life, or American property, or American independence and freedom. As was stated by the gentleman, it is costing \$50,000 to kill a man in warfare. Why, gracious goodness, we ought to be thinking of what we can do to save life instead of trying to destroy it, and that was the main point in what the gentleman from Minnesota brought out. He wants to save life and wants to protect American boys and not let anything that may happen in this country lead us into the war at such great cost of life, cost of happiness, cost in sorrow, and cost in misery.

You know the thing that impressed me this morning when we had the prayer by our beloved Chaplain, and it is something that impresses me every morning when the Chaplain gets up here and asks for divine guidance for the House of Representatives, for the Senate, and for the President, when there are not over 25 or 30 Members present at our prayer service—the thought was in my mind when the gentleman from Illinois, awhile ago, wanted to ask for a quorum, why can we not ask for a quorum just before the Chaplain of the House of Representatives leads us in prayer? If we could do that and the Members of the House would listen to the prayers that are being offered by the Chaplain of the House, it would probably be the best lesson and the best speech we could put before this House each day. It would help all and would not injure one person. If the membership would heed what is stated in asking for divine guidance, it might be the cause of turning the hearts of the Members of the Congress of the United States to the point where they would try in some manner, to a greater degree, to keep this country out of war. I believe that nothing better could be done than to invite the membership of the House to be

present before the Chaplain offers his prayer. Let us hope our attendance at the opening exercise will be greater in number.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman feel that a majority of the American people are in favor of our keeping out of this war?

Mr. RICH. Well, I would have said 6 months ago there was not a man in the United States who wanted war, but when we see the propaganda that is going on today, it is certainly amazing what a change is taking place in the minds of our people. I was at the Translux Theater last night and if there was ever any propaganda for getting this country into war offered, it was brought out there. You can go to any theater or almost any public place now or read almost any of the papers and you will see that they are creating the sentiment that we ought to get into this war. I hope and pray that the Congress will not be so foolish and that the membership of this House will say that we are not going to vote for war.

I wrote a letter this morning to a person who wanted to know whether I was in favor of sending our boys abroad. I have said time after time that I do not believe that anything can happen, I do not believe that any act they might commit in Europe or in Asia could be bad enough to cause me to vote to send one boy over to Europe to be slaughtered, because I believe that is none of our business and we should not ever think of sending a man across the water again to fight to make the world safe for democracy; we tried it once and it failed, it failed terribly; just look at Europe today; and as far as I am concerned, I do not believe they will ever get me to vote to send a boy across either ocean; in fact, I am sure I will not do so; and if we will tell the President of the United States and Secretary Hull to do a little more toward minding their own business and staying over here and looking after America and the American people, I do not believe we will get into war.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. I take it from what the gentleman says that nothing would induce him to vote for a declaration of war, the driving off of the seas of our ships or anything else.

Mr. RICH. If anybody comes over here and attacks us I will be the first one to protect this country, but I am talking about a war of aggression and I believe, honestly, Governor, that we are building up this great war machine and doing everything we can with the idea that we will ultimately get into this war. I honestly believe that. If a man came up to you and knocked your hat off, you would not shoot him. You would either have him arrested or try to convince him he was doing what he should not do, and by kindness win his affection.

Mr. PIERCE. Does the gentleman think that Great Britain is in this war voluntarily?

Mr. RICH. No; but it is not our business to kill American boys and girls to protect Great Britain, if you want to know my answer to that. [Applause.]

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARNOLD. Does the gentleman know of one Member of the House who wants to join the war over there?

Mr. RICH. No; I do not know a Member of the House—
[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 more minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLER. Give him 5 more minutes.

Mr. RICH. If you will give me 5 minutes, I will say this: If you give Great Britain and the people who are putting forth the policy of urging us to sell overage ships, to sell overage tanks, which they are doing right now, and to sell

overage guns, and call our Navy overage and call anything else overage, I believe within a short time they would get 150 Members to say that we would enter that war.

Mr. KELLER. Do what?

Mr. RICH. Get us into this war.

Mr. KELLER. Is the gentleman one of them?

Mr. RICH. No; I am telling you that I am not. But let Mr. Roosevelt tell you that he wants to go to war, and I would like to know what your answer would be.

Mr. KELLER. You know very well what it would be without my telling you.

Mr. RICH. You bet your life I think I know. I think you would vote right with him, because you have voted that way for the last 8 years.

Mr. KELLER. Now I want to answer that.

Mr. RICH. You have voted that way most every time for the last 8 years. I do not care who the man is who has followed this New Deal and voted for New Deal policies for the last 8 years, he is only trying to set up in this country a dictatorship. I do not care what man in the House tries to challenge me on what I say, because I am not trying to hurt anybody, but I am telling you that if we want to keep America safe, if we want to follow our Constitution, if we want freedom of the press, freedom of religion, and freedom of speech, you cannot do what we have done in the last 7 years, can you?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Is the gentleman addressing me?

Mr. RICH. Certainly. You are about as sensible-looking person as I have ever seen. [Laughter.]

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Thank you. You know, when a man cannot say that a woman is good looking, the next best thing is to call her sensible. [Laughter and applause.] I think the gentleman is right and I think the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ALEXANDER] is right. I have every reason to think, from friends in Great Britain who are here for the duration, that not only the people of Great Britain but the people of Germany would like peace if they could have a just peace, but I think it is today as it was in 1917—neither nation wants to lose face. If either one could have a just peace, I am sure they would be glad to have it and take it without exhausting themselves. I think there is only one nation powerful enough today to offer such a peace; that is the United States; but I very much fear that we have placed ourselves in a position where they do not trust us. They fear we are going to try to be straight shooters instead of square shooters. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. RICH. That is right. I thank the lady for that very intelligent statement. I agree with her 100 percent. I want to say that Great Britain does not want to fight. The people of Germany do not want to fight. The people of Spain are so sick that they do not want to get in it. I do not believe the Italian people want to fight. I think if we were in a position where we could have a man who could say to those nations, "Why don't you put these things aside, stop wrecking your cities, and stop killing your people," it would be the finest thing in the world. But where have we gotten ourselves? What is the position of our country now in being an arbitrator?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It seems to me that anything of that sort we might do before election would be apt to bear the imputation of having political motives, but that after election the Congress could very suitably pass some such resolution.

Mr. RICH. If we do that, I will say that you cannot have anyone who has said, "Mr. Mussolini stuck us in the back," and expect him to be an arbitrator. You know you could not have a man like that, so you have to find somebody else. The only logical man to find is a new President, a new man, who can take a position whereby the people of this world will have confidence in him and have faith in him. That is the kind of a man we will have. [Applause.]

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes; I will yield to you forever if you will get up here and take my place and condemn war and all its horrors.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I want to warn the gentleman that it is very dangerous to say "peace" nowadays, because you run the risk of being called an "appeaser."

Mr. RICH. If anybody says that I am a "fifth columnist" just because I want to talk peace, and I want to keep this Nation out of war, they had better look out and stay far enough away from me, because I am not going to take it. [Laughter.] I think the time is here when we have got to talk plain. I think the time is here, if we want to have a united America that will try to solve the problems of Europe and Asia and stop the war between China and Japan and stop the war in Germany and Italy and England and all of the other countries, we must have a man in America that the Americans have faith in; we must have a man in America that the foreign countries have faith in, or we are going to lose the very position that you would like to have us in—the position of respect we desire among all nations of the world.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Well, I do not trust any man too far, as you know [laughter and applause], but I think that after election the Congress chosen by the people of the United States might form a nonpartisan board for that purpose, appointed by whomever shall be President.

Mr. RICH. Well, I think that is a good suggestion. Whoever is elected in November, as much as I think about some people that might be elected, I will say that it is our duty to bite our lips, get together, both Democrats and Republicans, and say that we are Americans first, and do anything we can to protect our Constitution, our country, and our people.

However, we are coming to the time when there will be an election, and I say right here that I am not for one certain man for President.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE. I want to know if the gentleman really knows what is going on in the world. I want to know if the gentleman has read *Mein Kampf*, Hitler's own book. Has he read what Hitler is doing; what Hitler is attempting to do; what he says he is going to do? Does the gentleman know anything about it? He does not talk as if he did.

Mr. RICH. I may say to the gentleman from Oregon that Mr. Hitler never took me into his confidence; he never told me what he was going to do, and I do not think he will ever do all he says he will do in his book. I do not think he can do it, if you mean he is coming over next to bottle us here in America.

Mr. PIERCE. The gentleman speaks as if he did not know what was going on in the world, or what Hitler has said.

Mr. RICH. I would not put any faith in that. I have no faith in any statement he makes. But I can tell the gentleman very positively I am never going to salute "heil Hitler," nor am I going to salute "heil Roosevelt." I will be shot first. [Applause.]

Mr. PIERCE. The gentleman just does not know what is going on in the world.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. McCORMACK]. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that over the radio this morning I heard a program of questions to Mr. Willkie and what Mr. Willkie had to say in answer concerning his attitude toward the war. That program went out over a national hook-up. Later in the day I shall ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including that statement, and may I ask the House—

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Not just now; may I ask the membership, if they did not hear that broadcast, to read the statement which I shall insert in the Record if permitted to do so?

Mr. RICH. I know Mr. Willkie is going to keep us out of war if he is elected President of the United States. I know

he, if elected President of the United States, will use his every effort to bring about peace between nations. He will help all classes in this country, he will help the farmer, the laboring man, everybody in America, and spread abroad through this land the spirit of living under, abiding by, and living up to the Constitution of the United States. Mr. Willkie is going to be the man who will insure the continuance of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion. And after the election we are all going to get together and help Mr. Willkie cement us together in the bonds of brotherly love so that we shall not only be able to help America but because of the position Mr. Willkie will have attained by that time he will be able to settle the differences of countries all over the world. Peace will come again to the nations on earth, happiness will abound everywhere, and the God of Heaven will reign eternally. [Applause.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, of all the optimists of whom I have ever heard, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is entitled to the blue ribbon when he stands here on this floor and tells you that Wendell L. Willkie, if, when, and provided this country should ever experience the calamity of having him for President, would inspire confidence, spread prosperity, and promote the peace of mankind. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] said he would place in the Record later a statement his candidate made as to what he proposed to do—if elected. If he heard Mr. Willkie say anything about what he intended to do, I advise him to put it in the Record now, before Mr. Willkie changes his mind or reads another speech written by somebody else. [Applause.]

I have heard with amazement, and read with confusion, the speeches delivered by Mr. Willkie on his western swing. I do not believe I have read anything or heard anything to compare with it since Don Quixote, with his wooden sword and paper crown, marched across the plains of western Europe to fight the windmills and the funeral processions with which he came in contact. There has not been such a spectacle in a national campaign since Andrew Gump made his famous bid for the Presidency a few years ago. [Laughter.]

Like Andrew Gump, Mr. Willkie seems to be all things to all men. He went out West and told the farmers he was going to lower the taxes on their lands. If he was serious when he made, or read that speech, which must have been written in New York, because anybody outside of Wall Street would have known that the President of the United States could not have anything to do with the taxes on the farmers' lands. [Applause.] If he was serious when he made, or read, that statement, he showed his ignorance of the farmers' problems. If he was not serious, he showed contempt for the farmers' intelligence.

He talks about democracy, after having been connected with one of the greatest monopolies in the country—one that has been engaged in breaking down our democracy for the last 20 years.

He talks about freedom of the press, after the utility of which he was the head went down to Chattanooga, Tenn., and used the money wrung from the helpless users of electricity to destroy a local newspaper because it was appealing for justice for the power consumers in the Tennessee Valley area.

Freedom of the press. He is evidently for freedom of the utility-controlled press only.

He stood before the farmers of Indiana and waved a receipt for his electric light and power bill and said his bill was too high, that the Rural Electrification Administration was overcharging him. He was at that moment advertising to the people of Indiana the fact that they never would have had electricity on the farms of that State if it had not been for the Rural Electrification Administration created by the Roosevelt administration. [Applause.]

He tells you he is for rural electrification. When did he get that way? I am one man in this House who can give you some evidence of his activities with reference to rural electrification. In my opinion, he is rural electrification's public enemy No. 1. The Commonwealth & Southern, of which he was the head, owns the Mississippi Power Co. That company built one short rural power line in the county in which I live—Lee County, Miss.—and they charged the farmers \$3.25 a month "line charge," whether they used any electricity at all or not, and then charged 5 cents a kilowatt-hour for the electricity used. That made 25 kilowatt-hours of electricity a month cost a farmer on that line \$4.50.

Our cooperative power association bought that line and is now charging \$1.00 for 25 kilowatt-hours a month, and 25 cents of that \$1.00 goes to help pay for the line, making 25 kilowatt-hours of electricity a month cost him 75 cents instead of \$4.50, the amount charged by the Willkie utility when these farmers had no way of protecting themselves.

Remember it is the same line, the same farmer, and the same power. At that time the Commonwealth & Southern was buying this power wholesale from the Government at Muscle Shoals at 2 mills a kilowatt-hour, under a contract made with the Republican administration, but when a farmer on this line got 25 kilowatt-hours of it he paid Mr. Willkie's company \$4.50.

Now the cooperative power association is buying this same Muscle Shoals power wholesale from the T. V. A. at 5.5 mills a kilowatt-hour, and the same farmer on the same line gets 25 kilowatt-hours a month for 75 cents instead of \$4.50—or just exactly one-sixth of what he paid the Willkie company for it.

And I might add that his companies tried to kill off rural electrification by building spite lines as interferences until the farmers in some sections took their shotguns and ran the men who were building those spite lines off their lands.

Mr. Willkie stood on the banks of the Columbia River a few days ago and tried to lead the people of Oregon and Washington to believe that he was in favor of public power, after trying all these years to destroy the T. V. A., the greatest weapon the American people have ever had for their protection against the extortionate overcharges the private power companies have been exacting for electric energy.

Mr. Willkie pretends that he reduced light and power rates in the T. V. A. area, when as a matter of fact his companies never reduced rates in that section until the competition of the T. V. A. compelled them to do so; and they never reduced them elsewhere until the publication of the T. V. A. yardstick rates showed the people what electricity was worth, and an aroused public opinion forced them to lower their rates to keep down competition.

Mr. Willkie talks about common honesty in his attacks on the Roosevelt administration. In his speech at Seattle, Wash., he said:

Nowadays it is about as hard to start a new business as it is to rob a bank, and the risks of going to jail are about as great in both cases.

The only new business organized in recent years with which Mr. Willkie has been connected that I know anything about, was the superholding company known as the Commonwealth & Southern. Every man connected with the gigantic fraud that was committed when that company was organized probably ought to have gone to jail.

According to the report of the Federal Trade Commission, it was one of the most brazen acts of its kind ever committed. Was Mr. Willkie one of the guilty parties? We will let the record speak.

The record of the Federal Trade Commission shows that in February 1930 the Commonwealth & Southern was formed by the merger of four small companies, the Allied Power & Light Corporation, the Penn-Ohio Edison Co., the Commonwealth Power Corporation, and the Southeastern Power & Light Co.

The day those corporations were merged into the new Commonwealth & Southern the ledger value of their securities

amounted to \$340,896,260.27. They were placed on the books of the new Commonwealth & Southern Corporation, that same day, at \$872,101,832.19, or a write-up of \$531,205,571.92.

What did that extra \$531,205,571.92 represent? It represented wind, water, and Power Trust rascality!

Do not take my word concerning this diabolical transaction, but let the record speak. I quote from the report of the Federal Trade Commission, which investigated this proposition:

A table showing the ledger value of securities owned by each of the merged companies at the date of merger, and ledger values of the same securities as shown by the records of the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation on the same date, is presented below:

1	Ledger value of securities owned as shown by books of—		Appreciation
	Merged companies	Commonwealth & Southern Corporation	
2	3	4	
Allied Power & Light Corporation	\$3,573,997.65	\$21,583,038.35	\$18,009,040.70
Penn-Ohio Edison Co.	47,301,400.22	107,341,619.23	60,040,219.01
Commonwealth Power Corporation	89,742,899.05	372,234,258.32	282,491,359.27
Southeastern Power & Light Co.	200,277,963.35	370,942,916.29	170,664,952.94
Total	340,896,260.27	872,101,832.19	531,205,571.92

The total difference shown in column 4 of the table, in the amount of \$531,205,571.92, represents the appreciation in ledger values of the securities formerly owned by the four merged or consolidated companies as valued on the books of the Commonwealth & Southern Corporation immediately after the merger.

With one stroke of the pen they inflated those values \$531,205,571.92, and then proceeded to sell securities against those inflated valuations. That is what they call thievery within the law.

While Mr. Willkie and his cohorts are clamoring for law enforcement, why not enforce the law against using the mails to defraud? Every time an official, an attorney, an agent, or a representative of the Commonwealth & Southern wrote a letter, a circular, or a postal card to induce people to buy stock in the Commonwealth & Southern, or to invest in its securities in any way, with this \$531,000,000 of water in its capital structure, and sent it through the mail, they violated the laws against using the mails to defraud.

The Attorney General of the United States should investigate this proposition thoroughly, and enforce the law just as rigorously against these utility racketeers as he would enforce it against the misguided individual who uses the mails to swindle his neighbor out of a few dollars.

Shall we continue the prosecution of Hopson for using the mails to defraud in connection with the misconduct of the Associated Gas & Electric Co. and at the same time permit the ones who perpetrated this gigantic steal to escape?

Our Government is being destroyed from within by these vast monopolies that disregard human rights, disregard the laws of the land in the perpetration of such misconduct, as well as by their wholesale robbery of the unprotected public.

Now let us look back of this Commonwealth & Southern and see what we find. As I said, the formation of the Commonwealth & Southern resulted from the consolidation of the four holding companies listed in the Federal Trade Commission's report. The Penn-Ohio Edison was a holding company incorporated in 1923 under the laws of Delaware. This holding company owned all the common stock of six operating companies and 99 percent of the common stock of the Northern Ohio Power & Light Co.

These operating companies then supplied power to 800,000 people in northeastern Ohio and western Pennsylvania, and included service to such principal cities as Akron, Youngstown, Salem, Ohio, and Sharon in Pennsylvania. The operation of these companies was contracted and placed under the supervision of the Allied Power & Light Corporation.

The Commonwealth Power Co. was also a holding company incorporated under the Maine laws in 1922. Its operating subsidiaries then served 621 communities, with an estimated

population exceeding 2,360,000 located in Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Tennessee, and Georgia. The Michigan operations were conducted by two major operating companies, namely, the Consumers Power Co. and the Southern Michigan Light & Power, and covered about 345 cities and towns with a population exceeding 1,525,000.

The Illinois properties then consisted of three operating companies, namely, the Central Illinois Light, Illinois Power, and the Illinois Electric Power Co. The first two companies served 48 cities, with a population exceeding 250,000, and included such large cities as Peoria and Springfield. In Springfield, Mr. Willkie's company operates in competition with Springfield's municipal plant and has had to meet the competition of the public-plant rates. The Illinois Electric Power Co. was a generating company wholesaling to the Illinois properties and to foreign private companies. The Indiana operations of the Commonwealth were carried on by the Southern Indiana Operating Co., centering around Evansville and reaching a territory with population in excess of 125,000.

The Ohio operations of the Commonwealth Co. were conducted by the Ohio Edison Co., which served 45 communities with population exceeding 105,000, in and around Springfield.

The Commonwealth Power Co. in 1925 acquired the Tennessee Electric Power Co. Tennessee Electric Power Co. then served 139 communities in Tennessee and 5 in northern Georgia and wholesaled to other private companies serving over 100 communities in eastern Tennessee. The population of the communities directly served by Tennessee Electric Power Co. exceeded 375,000. This original Commonwealth Co. formed the backbone of the property later sold to the T. V. A. In addition to these holding and operating companies, Commonwealth operated through the Utilities Coal Corporation coal mines in Illinois and Kentucky.

The Southeastern Power & Light was also a holding company formed in 1924 to acquire the Alabama Power Co., Southeastern Fuel Co., Georgia Power Co., South Carolina Power Co., Mississippi Power Co., the Gulf Power Co., and the Gulf Electric Co. These subsidiaries at the time of the merger served 868 communities and a population of approximately 5,000,000. The object of this organization was to get control of the power to be generated at Muscle Shoals.

The Allied Power & Light was a combined holding, engineering, construction, and supervising company. It was formed in 1928 by acquiring the business and contracts of Hodenpyl, Hardy & Co., and Stevens & Wood, and handled all the engineering, construction, and supervision for all the original Commonwealth properties and the Penn-Ohio Edison.

WILLKIE'S BACKGROUND

I trust that you have followed closely the dates of the above mergers so that we can compare Mr. Willkie's own statement of experience, as given in *Who's Who*. After a short tenure with the Firestone Rubber Co., in a subordinate legal position in 1919, Mr. Willkie joined the Akron law firm of Mather & Nesbit in 1919, which connection he continued until 1929. This firm were the attorneys for the Ohio Edison. In those early holding-company days, the principal work of the local attorneys was lobbying before legislatures and regulatory bodies, franchise renewals, and rate fixing.

In 1927 and 1928 Mr. Willkie was lobbying at the National Capital against the Walsh investigation resolution, and assisting Weadock, who represented the National Electric Light Association in opposing that resolution. One of the briefs filed before the Senate committee in opposition to the Walsh resolution was prepared by Mather, Nesbit & Willkie, attorneys for the Ohio utility. Remember this was the resolution under which the Federal Trade Commission was operating when it uncovered the rascality perpetrated in the organization of the Commonwealth & Southern in which more than \$531,000,000 of water was poured into the capital structure.

In 1929 Mr. Willkie moved to New York to become associated with his old N. E. L. A. associate, Mr. Weadock, in the firm of Weadock and Willkie, general counsel of the Commonwealth

& Southern. The records indicate that this firm's only client was Commonwealth & Southern. Mr. Willkie's New York firm continued in this capacity until Mr. Willkie was elected president of the Commonwealth & Southern in 1933.

The Commonwealth & Southern was a Morgan-Bonbright creation. The New York Times of May 24, 1933, shows that George H. Howard, one of the Commonwealth & Southern directors was a ground-floor participant in the stock-market cuts of J. P. Morgan & Co. It will be remembered that friends of J. P. Morgan were given blocks of stock below the market price. Anyone interested in this phase of manipulation can brush up by reading the long record of the 1933 Senate banking investigation.

Anyone with realistic information on corporate practice knows that all political, public policy, financial, and franchise matters are handled by a corporation's legal counsel. The corporation counsel in one of these useless holding companies is the assistant chief of staff, who is supposed to guide the financial big shots so that thievery within the law can be accomplished without interference.

From 1919 up to the Republican convention of 1940, Mr. Willkie's entire experience (except a short initial interval with Firestone) was with the legal staff of Commonwealth & Southern and predecessor companies. He was a part of this legal staff when all these mergers and manipulations took place. At no time was he connected directly with the actual operations, or the task of making the wheels go around. The actual operation of the properties with which Mr. Willkie was associated, were handled by Hodenpyl & Hardy, Stevens and Wood, and the Allied Power, and since the dissolution of the engineering adjuncts, this phase of Commonwealth & Southern business has been handled by the operating men in these two organizations and those who came over with the Commonwealth merger.

Mr. Willkie's entire utility background—and that is the sum total of his business experience—has been in the field of legal legerdemain. He was in the set-up as an assistant chief of staff and chief of staff, during all the manipulations of the Commonwealth & Southern and its predecessors for the last 20 years. In spite of General Johnson's assertion, Mr. Willkie was in the picture when Penn-Ohio Edison was formed in 1923, and when Penn-Ohio Edison was a component in the assembly of the Commonwealth & Southern in 1929.

WATERED SECURITIES

As I have pointed out, at the time the Commonwealth & Southern was formed, the ledger value—book property account—of the companies forming the combine was \$340,896,260.19. This value, according to the Federal Trade Commission, had been previously written up in the 1922-23 and succeeding combinations. Prior write ups were found by the Federal Trade Commission, but the total prior write ups can only be reached by estimate. The "per customer ledger value" of the four holding companies going in the Commonwealth & Southern combination indicates a write up of around \$38 per customer. The first full year's report of the Commonwealth & Southern shows 1,053,759 electric consumers. Therefore, by such an estimate the prior write up was at least \$40,000,000. This is a conservative estimate as it neglects the gas, ice, transportation, and water properties.

In addition to these prior write ups an actual audit of the books of the Commonwealth & Southern by the Federal Trade Commission discloses another write up, as I said, of \$531,205,572 in the formation of the giant holding company known as the Commonwealth & Southern, which serves, or is served by, a population of nearly 10,000,000. Against these write ups new securities were issued and sold. The 1930 report of the Commonwealth & Southern sets out the plant account as \$1,032,252,068, and securities outstanding, plus current debt, as \$1.005 per \$1 of ledger value—the ledger securities outstanding and the plant value for balance-sheet purposes were practically the same.

Exclusive of the funded and current debt and preferred stock of the subsidiaries, the balance sheet shows the holding company issuing and selling \$150,000,000 of \$6 no par

preferred stock, \$51,900,000 of Commonwealth & Southern debt obligations, 33,673,328 shares of common stock and 17,588,956 common-stock option warrants.

As is known by those familiar with holding-company manipulations, the control of the common stock of the subsidiaries is the key step in the formation of a superholding company. Accordingly in the first half of 1929, with the panic in sight, the insiders of Morgan & Co. and Bonbright started the Commonwealth & Southern vehicle upon which the public was to take an inglorious ride. The gas which started this vehicle was \$15,000,000 of Bonbright cash and \$13,000,000 of Morgan cash, borrowed from two Morgan utilities. This and something like \$15,000,000 other cash was used to buy up substantial amounts of the common stock of the three major underlying holding companies. This initial control stock was purchased by the insiders at \$19 per share.

With the common stocks in their possession, the inside manipulators then commenced negotiations to trade the remaining common shares of the underlying holding companies for Commonwealth & Southern shares at a price which ranged from \$24 to \$24.40 per share. The next month Commonwealth & Southern shares were placed on the New York curb market and daily transactions ran into hundreds of thousands. Nine days after listing, trading in Commonwealth & Southern shares exceeded the million mark. The ride was on and the reluctant share owners of the subsidiaries rushed in to trade the remaining subsidiary shares for proposed Commonwealth & Southern common. This is how Commonwealth & Southern was formed and the public was coaxed for a ride. In 22 days the vehicle had been created, the insiders had a \$15,000,000 profit on the original shares and the investing public had climbed aboard. By October 1929, Commonwealth & Southern common reached nearly \$25 per share.

As bait, over 17,000,000 shares of option shares were issued at \$30 per share. The traders advised that the shares would reach \$50 by the end of the year. The shameful fraud of this stock-jobbing manipulation can be shown by a few simple figures.

The 33,673,328 common shares at, say, \$25 a share represent \$840,000,000. At \$50 a share, anticipated, this common would represent \$1,680,000,000. The 17,588,956 options at the issuing price represent \$527,000,000. On top of these huge amounts were \$916,000,000 of Commonwealth & Southern and subsidiary bonds, preferred stocks, and other obligations, such as customers' deposits, and so forth. Think of the fantasy of a paper value of \$2,283,000,000 to \$3,123,000,000 for a legitimate ledger value of only about \$301,000,000—actual ledger value—of subsidiaries of the Commonwealth & South-

ern, less prior write ups, or \$340,896,260.27 at the time the company was formed. I would like to ask Mr. Willkie what the rates would have to be to support such a capital structure which his inside friends and employers erected in 1929.

Did they use the mails to defraud in selling their watered stocks against these inflated values?

Today the options are worthless.

Mr. Willkie in his last balance sheet placed the common at \$168,366,640, or \$5 per share. The market value of the common share is now around \$1.25, or \$42,000,000. The paper stock and option write down amounted to one and three tenths billion dollars. The investors became victims. Weadock and Willkie were assistant chiefs of staff during the time of the transactions.

Even with the write down on 33,000,000 shares of common to \$5, the electric book value per customer of the Commonwealth & Southern is \$672 per customer. When Mr. Willkie took over the presidency of Commonwealth & Southern, the company had the second highest per-customer valuation in the country. The per-customer reduction from \$833 in 1930 to \$672 in 1938 arose not from any substantial lowering of capitalization but from taking on more customers.

Compare these figures with \$303 for Insull's Commonwealth Edison, and \$264 for all the public municipal plants in America. If Mr. Willkie's company had been efficiently operated financially, as the average public plant in America, it would have \$550,000,000 less securities outstanding. Tacoma, Washington, has an outstanding debt of \$123.50 per customer. The average American municipal plant has, through amortization, an outstanding debt of only \$94 per customer. Mr. Willkie's company in spite of stock write downs, still has securities outstanding in excess of \$670 per customer.

All the magazine talk of Mr. Willkie's rate-reducing policies is pure "hokum." The only way that he can reduce his company's rates to the T. V. A. yardstick level is by putting the Commonwealth & Southern through the wringer and squeezing the water out of its capital structure. Any intelligent person knows that it is impossible for Mr. Willkie's company to reach Tacoma rate levels with \$670 per customer of securities outstanding, compared with \$123.50 for Tacoma. To argue otherwise is willful deceit. But it can be done by squeezing the water out of the capital structure and eliminating the waste, graft, and extravagance.

WILLKIE'S OVERCHARGE

In the year 1938, before the T. V. A. sale, Willkie's companies overcharged their electric consumers \$60,510,000 per year based on Tacoma rates. The details of these overcharges are given in the following table:

Overcharges of subsidiaries of Commonwealth & Southern for different classes of service, calendar year 1938, based on Tacoma's filed tariffs

Operating company	State	Residential overcharges	Commercial and industrial overcharges	Highway and street lights, etc.	Other utilities and railroads	Total
Alabama Power Co.	Alabama	\$2,190,000	\$4,865,000	\$218,000	¹ \$243,000	\$7,030,000
Georgia Power Co.	Georgia	3,310,000	7,231,200	455,000	¹ 706,000	10,290,200
Tennessee Electric Power Co.	Tennessee	2,325,000	3,810,100	159,000	368,000	6,662,100
Consumers Power Co.	Michigan	5,635,000	8,763,500	561,000	220,100	15,179,600
Ohio Edison Co.	Ohio	3,312,000	4,515,600	356,000	754,000	8,937,600
South Carolina Power Co.	South Carolina	578,000	987,300	70,900	134,900	1,691,300
Central Illinois Light Co.	Illinois	1,044,000	1,812,100	263,500	168,000	3,317,600
Gulf Power Co.	Florida	379,000	498,200	35,050		912,250
Pennsylvania Power Co.	Pennsylvania	854,000	1,171,800	120,800	74,200	2,220,800
Mississippi Power Co.	Mississippi	650,000	1,900,000	316,500	91,400	2,957,900
Southern Indiana Gas & Electric	Indiana	589,000	768,000	69,800	¹ 26,150	1,400,650
Total		20,866,000	36,322,800	2,655,550	665,650	60,510,000

¹ Below Tacoma average rate +.

In spite of these rate overcharges, Mr. Willkie operated his companies from 1933 to date by reducing guaranteed dividends on preferred stocks. Up to the date of the Republican convention, Mr. Willkie's company was in arrears to his Commonwealth & Southern preferred stockholders \$16.50 per share, or \$24,800,000 on 1,500,000 shares. He was only able to keep his head above water by taking \$24,800,000 from his preferred stockholders and writing down the common stock

from the original sale price of \$24 a share to less than \$5 a share, or \$19 a share on 33,673,328 shares, which represents a loss to them of \$640,000, and it has now dropped to \$1.25 a share, as the daily market reports show.

With this record of Mr. Willkie's, and the record of the forces with which he trains before us, I find it impossible to follow the optimistic gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] when he tells us that Mr. Willkie is the man to elect

President of the United States if we want to inspire confidence, spread prosperity, and restore the peace and happiness of mankind. [Applause.]

TRANSFERRING OF JURISDICTION OF ARLINGTON FARM TO WAR DEPARTMENT AND DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 4107, to transfer the jurisdiction of the Arlington Farm, Virginia, to the jurisdiction of the War Department and the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes, with House amendments, insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES]?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what property does this bill transfer?

Mr. JONES of Texas. This involves the Arlington Farm over across the river.

Mr. RICH. You are transferring it where?

Mr. JONES of Texas. To the War Department.

Mr. RICH. Is that for the duration of the war?

Mr. JONES of Texas. No. They are using part of it now.

Mr. RICH. Is that where they are building the camp on this side of Arlington Cemetery?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I understand they have stationed some soldiers there.

Mr. RICH. We are taking that land which was formerly a farm experimental station and now building an Army camp on it?

Mr. JONES of Texas. They are going to use it for that purpose and for protection purposes for the bridge and for the city.

Mr. RICH. Is it going to cost the Federal Government anything to make that transfer?

Mr. JONES of Texas. It is going to cost the Federal Government nothing to make the transfer. There will be a provision and has been provision in a bill for the purchase of other areas for the work of the farm that is now being done there and for some adjacent land that will be purchased.

Mr. RICH. I understand we have between here and Baltimore great areas of land which are now used by these experimental stations. Why is it necessary to have additional land for that purpose? Especially near the District of Columbia line, where land is so expensive.

Mr. JONES of Texas. This particular organization tests the new plants and seeds that have been brought in here to see that no pests and no diseases are transmitted to various parts of the country. They do a very fine work in protecting the country against the importation of diseases that might affect plants. They have done a great deal of exceptionally good work. There is some work that has been done in various sections of the country that I might question the benefit of, but not the work of this organization.

Mr. RICH. I think the particular thing they are trying to do is fine, but I question very much, with the acreage that the Agriculture Department has in close proximity to Washington, whether we ought to go out now and buy additional land.

Mr. JONES of Texas. They claim they have no available land nearby, and this must be nearby for the particular purpose they use it. As a matter of fact, may I say to the gentleman, that the Department of Agriculture is not anxious to have this done. They prefer to keep it, but the Army thinks this is a desirable place to have men stationed for the protection of the bridge and for the protection of the city.

Mr. RICH. I am not interested in embarrassing the Army or the Department of Agriculture, but I think the Federal Government is going out and buying entirely too much land. It owns too much ground now. It is getting into business of all kinds. After a while there will not be an opportunity for the individuals of this country. We are just socializing the country, making it a communistic nation.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The greater part of this is not for the buying of the land, but for the moving of the equipment and the establishment of the necessary buildings and stations to do the work.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. Are they using this land to test the seed that is sent here by different States?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Plants and seeds brought in from different countries. Occasionally we must bring in seeds and plants from other countries, and they are brought in under the right to bring them in. They require them to be sent here and be tested so that diseases of plants will not scatter throughout the country. They also make tests to determine the suitability of plants for different sections of the country.

Mr. ENGEL. How many acres of land are they buying for this testing purpose?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I do not know.

Mr. ENGEL. How much an acre are they paying?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I do not believe they have actually located the land yet. This is just to make the fund available to duplicate their work and activities. I assume they will buy just such amount as will be necessary. I understand they have options on some land between Washington and Baltimore.

Mr. ENGEL. I imagine this land across the river here is worth \$1,000 an acre.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes. They will not pay anything like the price that land would bring for the new land, so they assure me.

Mr. ENGEL. Why should they not go out a distance where they could get land more reasonably?

Mr. JONES of Texas. They are going to be some distance farther away, but it is necessary to have it near the city as a matter of saving expense of operation.

Mr. ENGEL. Could the gentleman obtain the information for the RECORD as to the number of acres and how much they are paying per acre for this land they expect to buy?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I understand they have an option on a 700-acre tract a few miles out of Washington—about 700 acres—at an average price of approximately \$300 per acre. That is the substance of the information that I have been furnished. That is the land that will probably be procured.

Mr. ENGEL. How many acres did they say they wanted to buy?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I do not know that they have actually determined that. I believe they said they needed between 400 and 700 acres of land. Perhaps it would be necessary to purchase a small amount more in order to secure the proper type.

Mr. ENGEL. How much of an appropriation are they authorized to have for this purpose?

Mr. JONES of Texas. The total appropriation for the moving, the construction of the buildings, the purchase of the land, and the furnishing of the essential equipment is \$3,000,000.

Mr. ENGEL. How much of that did they say in the hearings—there were hearings, I assume—was for the purchase of this 600 acres of land?

Mr. JONES of Texas. They did not give the exact figures, although it is my understanding that much less than a third of it will be used for the purchase of land. I am not qualified to give the gentleman any specific assurance on it except that they said the land was not by any means the chief element of cost.

Mr. ENGEL. Does the gentleman mean to say that a third of \$3,000,000 is going to be used to buy 600 acres?

Mr. JONES of Texas. No. I do not have the information and I do not believe they have, because they do not know just what land they will ultimately secure. However, I think they will probably obtain the land on which they now have an option.

Mr. ENGEL. The reason I am asking is that one of the departments came before our committee with a proposal to spend \$1,200 an acre for cemetery land. We turned it down, and they paid \$800 an acre for it. I am afraid we are having the same proposition here.

Mr. JONES of Texas. That particular thing is not going to be done by this organization.

Mr. ENGEL. It will have to come before the Appropriations Committee for the money, and justify the appropriation?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Certainly, they will have to get the appropriation.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. This is a bill that was on the Consent Calendar last week?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes; it was passed last week.

Mr. KEAN. Was there not a larger authorization than \$3,000,000? It seems to me there were two authorizations, for \$8,000,000, I believe.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The gentleman was asking only about the appropriation for the purchases of new properties and equipment, the new properties for the experiment farm and station. There is an additional authorization for the purchase of the adjacent properties over there which the War Department will need, including the old Washington-Hoover Airport, and which are also needed to prevent the erection of buildings which would interfere with the landing field at the new airport.

Mr. KEAN. So the total authorizations are about \$8,000,000?

Mr. JONES of Texas. The total authorization for the purchase of land is \$5,000,000 for the War Department.

Mr. KEAN. Can the gentleman tell me whether the Senate changed these figures?

Mr. JONES of Texas. No; the Senate left the figures as they are. They simply disagreed to the House amendments. The gentleman recalls that we took out the provision for the National Parks Service and put in the bill a provision that if enough of the land was not needed to enable the Department of Agriculture to continue there they should continue without purchasing the new land. It does not direct the purchase of the new land, but conditions it upon the need of the War Department for the present site. In other words, the House safeguarded the provision of the authorization by providing that they should use it only in the event the Army found it necessary to use so much of the land that it could not be continued for experimental purposes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. Does the Department have authority either in this bill or in general law to take land through condemnation proceedings in case the owners ask more for the land than the land is worth?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I understand they can do that for any public purpose. They have general authority on that.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I wish to say here that there is no one in the House of whom I think more of than the gentleman from Texas, who has charge of agricultural legislation, but I want to ask the gentleman this question. If we are going to do this experimental work, why do we have to have a farm so close to the District of Columbia? Just 10 to 15 miles from here the Department of Agriculture has thousands of acres of land. Why could not that land be used?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Where do they have those thousands of acres near here?

Mr. RICH. Between here and Baltimore, about 10 or 15 miles out on the road to Baltimore.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I understand that the land they own anywhere near Washington is already being used. As I stated to the gentleman, I do not undertake to defend every particular type of experimentation that may be carried on throughout the country, but this particular work is national work and it is for the protection of the entire Nation.

Mr. RICH. We want the work to go on, but I say this now, let us get down to brass tacks. If the gentleman will use his

influence to get the Department of Agriculture to put this experimental station on this land within 10 miles of the District line, we can save spending \$2,500 an acre for ground over here that they may buy, and perhaps it will cost \$5,000 an acre. This country cannot afford to buy land at that price as a farm and nobody knows it better than the gentleman from Texas.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JONES of Texas. I will state to the gentleman that we went over this very thoroughly and questioned them very closely about the necessity of acquiring the land and also urged upon them the necessity of going a little farther out and buying land on a much cheaper basis, and I want to assure the gentleman that I am in thorough accord with that sentiment. I do not want them to pay \$1 more than is essential, but I do want this particular work, which protects the entire country, to be continued.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman will try his best with the Department of Agriculture I am sure he will see that within a year they will be using its experimental station on the Baltimore Pike, within 10 to 15 miles of the District, for this particular purpose, and we will not buy this ground at \$2,500 an acre.

Mr. JONES of Texas. If they can use that land or a part of it I shall certainly be anxious for them to do it and I shall urge them to do it.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Has the gentleman fully determined that this land is going to cost \$2,500 an acre?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Oh, no; I do not believe the land they will purchase will cost anything like that amount. It is the extra land over here that the War Department wants that may cost a considerable sum, but that is for military purposes and for protection of the city of Washington and, certainly, in the light of modern warfare we do need some protection here.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. JONES of Texas, Mr. FULMER, and Mr. HOPE.

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 100, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson the following Members of the House: Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Mr. BLOOM of New York, Mr. COX of Georgia, and Mr. CULKIN of New York.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief article from the Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn., which gives a very clear and concise statement with respect to the excess-profits-tax bill recently passed; and allow me to suggest that Members desiring a clear, concise, and brief statement on that measure will be interested in reading this article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE EUROPEAN WAR

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a remarkable interview with the new Japanese foreign minister, obtained by Larry Smith, International News Service correspondent, is carried in the Washington Times-Herald and other newspapers today.

In this interview the foreign minister, Matsuoka, asserts that Japan is ready to fight if the United States insists on

the status quo in Asia, or if the United States enters the European war.

Many of us in this House have repeatedly warned that the "meddling" policies of President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull gravely endanger the peace of this Nation. The statements of the Japanese foreign minister are simply added evidence of the possible disastrous consequences of the war policy of the Roosevelt administration—a policy which has been marked by undiplomatic utterances, denunciation of powers with whom we are at peace, inviting war while we are totally unprepared.

I do not know that there is anything Congress can do about this unfortunate situation. Certainly in its present frame of mind it will never vote for a declaration of war; but, in common with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I am apprehensive that the President and his Secretary of State will, by hook or crook, bring about an incident that will make America's entrance into the war inevitable.

I am as firmly convinced as I can possibly be of anything that if Mr. Roosevelt is reelected President of the United States we will assuredly go into this war as we went into the first World War following the election of Woodrow Wilson. Indeed, I am not so sure that this administration is not prepared to plunge the country into war before election if that becomes necessary for the success of the third term.

Politicians may prate about being opposed to war, but what credence can we place in any such pledges when they emanate from individuals who have repeatedly broken their solemn pledges? It is most disagreeable to have to make a statement like this concerning the Chief Executive of our country, but I am afraid that we are going to war, maybe before election. I am satisfied that we are going to get into it immediately following the election.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Does not the gentleman think by reason of his long experience here in Congress, and the gentleman has served here as long and as honorably as any Member of Congress, that the sentiment in the country is overwhelmingly in favor of Congress remaining close to the Capitol?

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, absolutely.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Does not the gentleman believe that the reason for that is that the people believe what the gentleman has said, that the President is certainly determined to carry the country into war?

Mr. KNUTSON. I think that sentiment is entertained by Democrats as well as by Republicans. Certainly, with the overwhelming Democratic majority in Congress, they could vote an adjournment any day they wanted to, but they do not want to do so, because they do not want to see the situation get out of hand.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when a Member of Congress—and I respect the gentleman profoundly—makes a serious charge that has just been made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], that charge cannot go by unchallenged and unanswered. The gentleman has a right to his own opinion but when he makes the charge that any President, no matter who that President may be, and in the present case President Roosevelt, "would plunge the United States into war for the purpose of reelection," I label that as a statement which is unworthy of anyone who is possessed of

a mind which entertains respect for any man who is President of the United States. [Applause.]

I am not going to characterize the statements made by my friend, because I do not want to enter into intolerant debate. These are serious days. These times are too serious for men who are Americans, whether they be Republicans or Democrats, as far as party politics are concerned, to make statements that will tend to unnecessarily and incorrectly alarm the American people.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] has made a speech, and in that speech he has made statements which have as their objective or as their result the unnecessary alarming of the American people. What are we going to do in America? Are we going to sit idly by and permit the dictator nations of the world to gang up on us? Are we going to run away, from fear, as other nations did, as the leaders of other democracies in the world did, until they could not run any farther, or are we going to look at it from a realistic angle and make those preparations which in our own hearts and in our own minds we know are necessary, not only for defense but for peace?

In these trying days, I submit, we are not confronted with normal considerations. We cannot think in normal terms. We must think in terms of reaction—what other nations intend to do, and we must act in terms of reaction. With the knowledge we have that decency among nations and justice among nations is ignored by powerful nations, with the knowledge of other independent people unprepared being destroyed, with that knowledge, as the greatest democracy in the world, what is our duty? Is it our duty to run, from fear, or is it our duty to prepare a defense which will, of necessity, instill fear into the minds of the aggressor nations of the world?

I resent as vigorously as I can the charge made by any Member of this Congress, or any person, that any President of the United States would deliberately plunge this country into war for the purpose of reelection, and that statement of mine applies to a Republican President as well as to a Democratic President. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 4270) entitled "An act to promote and strengthen the national defense by suspending enforcement of certain civil liabilities of certain persons serving in the Military and Naval Establishments, including the Coast Guard," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. GURNEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial appearing in the Washington Star of last night by David Lawrence, having reference to a very unfortunate incident that occurred in my congressional district of Michigan this week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a brief newspaper article dated Cleveland, October 3, by Mr. John T. Flynn.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short radio questionnaire broadcast this morning over a national hook-up, wherein Mr. Willkie states his position on war.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that I may have further time to extend the remarks I made on the conscription bill on September 4, the remarks to appear the same as if this extension had not been necessary.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by printing a short statement made by Bishop Leonard before the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee on Monday, September 30, 1940.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

NEW DEAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a short letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take the time of the House to read this letter I have here through a newspaper in my district, but I call it to your attention, and I want both Democrats and Republicans to look into this and help me prepare an answer for this man who has been a Democrat all his life.

This letter directed to me is reported in the Kewaunee Enterprise, a Democratic paper of 65 years' standing. It was published on Friday, September 27, 1940. The reason it is so important is because practically everybody in the United States is asking similar questions to the one this Democrat is asking of a Republican to answer for him. I appeal to all Members of the House, Democrats and Republicans, to help me answer this question.

The article referred to follows:

JUST LOOKING AROUND (By John Read Karel)

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We don't like to bother you, because we know you are busy with the defense program, the National Budget, and other important matters, but we're in a quandary and you told us to write to you when we had a very special quandary we were in.

Some time ago we talked to Mr. Lendved, the manager of our local telephone exchange, about a new telephone number for our office. He said he thought it could be arranged, which it was, and he has informed us that the new number will be in the fall telephone directory out next Tuesday.

This all seems simple so far, your honor, but here is where the quandary we are in comes in. Dast we change our telephone number, just like that, or is there a law? We have been reading the war and football news so much lately that we haven't paid much attention to what the New Deal is doing, and we certainly don't want to run afoul of any changes in the Constitution or Bill of Rights pertaining to changing a phone number.

We wouldn't bother you, Congressman, at a crucial time like this, but you're a businessman, too, and you know how it is. We might go right ahead and change our phone number, like folks have done for years and years. Then some day, just when we are getting used to it, we'll get a letter from a third assistant to the second assistant secretary of the S. E. C. or the N. B. R. P., Bureau of Fisheries, asking by what authority did we change our phone number and did we file Form 3-A under section 84 of the Revised Statutes.

Of course, we can write back politely and tell him we didn't know a person had to file Form 3-A to change a phone number. That won't work, your honor, and pretty soon six young college graduates with spectacles and hook noses will be prowling through our income-tax statements and our coal bills, on the theory that anybody who will change a phone number without permission will betray his country and rob the Treasury. Then there will be a letter from Madam Perkins, a public hearing, a Supreme Court decision, and—well, you know how it is, and maybe we were foolish to change our phone number in the first place.

Being right there at Washington, you might think we have got ourselves into this quandary without cause. But we remember that Kenosa shoemaker who almost went to jail because he was

insulted by a Government clerk, and once a West Kewaunee farmer had six investigators with brief cases on his premises because he moved two fence posts without permission on Form 6-B under the A. A. A. Soil Conservation Act.

So we wish you would look into this right away, Congressman, because we would like to have our new phone number next Tuesday if it can be done without violating any laws or disturbing the Government right at this time when it has so many other important things to worry about.

We have other things to worry about too, your honor, and we would sure like to get out of this quandary because, the way things are going, there will be other quandaries after election and we don't want to keep on wondering whether our phone number is legal.

Your constituent,

J. R. K.

SOLDIERS AND SAILORS CIVIL RIGHTS' BILL OF 1940

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 4207) to protect and strengthen the national defense by suspending enforcement of certain civil liabilities of certain persons serving in the Military and Naval Establishments, including the Coast Guard, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. THOMASON, COSTELLO, ARENDS, and HARNES.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a plan submitted by me to the General Staff of the Army suggesting the establishment of a mountain military training center for the intensive training of a small highly specialized force of the United States Army in the technique of operations in high altitude or in heavy snow or in both. I think this extension will probably somewhat exceed the usual limit. I have not an exact estimate on the cost, but it will probably exceed somewhat the limit. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding this I may be permitted to insert it in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Buffalo Evening News.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair with the understanding that the bells will be rung 15 minutes previous to the reassembling of the House.

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2:12 o'clock.

VERDIE BARKER

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5053) for the relief of Verdie Barker and Fred Walter, with Senate amendments thereto, and to concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$2,000".
Page 1, line 8, strike out "\$500" and insert "\$200".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. KENNEDY]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, the Senate reduced the amount allowed by the House?

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. And is the reduction satisfactory to the Member who introduced the bill in the House?

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. It is. I am making this request at the suggestion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9980) entitled "An act to revise and codify the nationality laws of the United States into a comprehensive nationality code."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title: H. R. 9972, an act authorizing the improvement of certain rivers and harbors in the interest of the national defense, and for other purposes.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR SUPPORT OF GOVERNMENT, 1941

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia submitted the following conference report on the bill, H. R. 10539, making supplemental appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10539) "making supplemental appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13, 22, 33, 40, 44, 45, 46, and 49.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 36, 38, 39, 42, 54, 55, 56, 58, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, and 70; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For an amount required to increase the compensation of the clerk of the Finance Committee of the Senate at the rate of \$1,000 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent, \$750."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In the first line of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the following: "(a)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$83,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Provided further, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from obligating any part of such appropriation for carrying on any of the functions or duties specifically conferred upon it by the National Labor Relations Act or to repeal any provision of such Act."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment to read as follows:

"Development of landing areas: For the construction, improvement, and repair of not to exceed two hundred and fifty public airports and other public landing areas in the United States and its territories and possessions, determined by the Administrator, with the approval of a Board composed of the Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy and Secretary of Commerce, to be necessary for national defense, including areas essential for safe

approaches and including the acquisition of land, \$40,000,000, of which \$2,000,000 shall be available for general administrative expenses, including the objects specified in section 204 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and including engineering services and supervision of construction: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be construed as precluding the use of other appropriations available for any of the purposes for which this appropriation is made."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Construction and repair: For an additional amount for the construction, repair, or rehabilitation of school, agency, hospital, or other buildings and utilities, including the purchase of furniture, furnishings, and equipment as follows:"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Fish and Wildlife Service"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$22,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$197,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the sum of "\$412.50" in line 10 of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ", together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay costs and interest as specified in such judgment"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 11, 23, 24, 34, 37, 43, 48, and 59.

EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
C. A. WOODRUM,
CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

ALVA B. ADAMS,
CARTER GLASS,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
FREDERICK HALE,
JOHN G. TOWNSEND, Jr.,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous-consent request granted yesterday, I call up the conference report and ask recognition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the conference report which comes up now under unanimous consent is the last deficiency bill. This bill as it left the House carried \$207,475,727.02 in cash and carried contract authorizations of \$60,258,001. As it comes to the House in this conference report it is \$228,132,013.35 cash, an increase of approximately \$21,000,000 of direct appropriations, and \$10,258,001 in contract authorizations, a decrease of \$50,000,000 in contract authorizations under the House amount.

The money increase in the bill as contained in the conference report is accounted for by the fact that between the time the bill passed the House and the time it was acted on in the Senate, additional Budget estimates were transmitted in connection with the defense program which were not

considered in the House, but which were considered by the Senate committee. The additional items are supported by the regular Budget estimate. Those estimates were in many instances curtailed by the Senate. The gross amount of the bill would be considerably more had there not been those curtailments and some eliminations.

Mr. Speaker, there are 70 Senate amendments to this bill, very few of them of any purport or of any particular interest. I might mention two or three of them perhaps that I believe the membership would be interested in; then I shall respond to questions if there are any.

There was an amendment respecting the National Labor Relations Board wherein the House sought to carry out the previous action of the House in directing discontinuance of the functions of one of the divisions of that Board. The House language in this bill was changed by the Senate amendment. It is understood by the conferees that the revised Senate language, as now contained in the conference report, will discontinue the personnel and the functions of that division with the exception of two or three people who are necessary to work on reports to be sent to the Congress. Have I stated that correctly?

Mr. TABER. I think the amount left for them to make that report is \$3,200, as I remember it, or something like that.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is the understanding that the functions of that division and its personnel are to be discontinued?

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It appears on page 19:

Provided, That not to exceed \$3,200 may be expended in performing those functions necessary to keep records and to make a report to Congress and to the President thereon as required by section 3 (c) of the National Labor Relations Act.

There is also added to the Senate language the provision that the action taken by the House in this appropriation bill and in this conference report is not intended to repeal any of the provisions of the organic act.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Was there any discussion with reference to the employment of Mr. Saposs?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There were no personalities involved in this, so far as the House was concerned. The history, as shown by the record, was that the subcommittee handling this original appropriation deducted a certain amount of money upon the theory that the functions of this particular division would be discontinued.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. For the information of the gentleman from South Dakota, may I say that Dr. Saposs' name was not mentioned in the subcommittee, according to my recollection, when it discussed this particular question.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It was not mentioned in the deficiency subcommittee, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It was during the action by the House though.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It may have been during the action by the House.

Another matter in which the House will be interested is the provision of \$30,000,000 and \$50,000,000 in contract authorizations for the civil airport program.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICHOLS. That amount was taken out by the Senate and is not in the bill as it is now; is that right?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I was just going to explain that, I may say to the gentleman. The provision remains in the bill with this change. We struck out of the language the \$50,000,000 for contract authorizations and increased the amount of cash to \$40,000,000. This reduces the program from an \$80,000,000 program to a \$40,000,000 program. We

provide a limitation of not to exceed 250 projects. This answers the question of embarking upon this program of some 4,000 projects that has been the subject of much discussion on the floor and in the press. We provide that the projects must be public airports or public landing fields. We provide that they must be passed upon by a board composed of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Commerce, who must certify that they are necessary for defense purposes.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. What page is that?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is on page 24 of the bill, but the gentleman will not find the changes I am going over now because it was just an hour or two ago that we decided upon them.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Many of us will have to answer messages during the afternoon on this subject. Would the gentleman mind reading the exact language agreed on by the conferees so that we may have it in our minds as we go to our offices?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The exact language agreed upon by the conferees is this:

For the construction, improvement, and repair of not to exceed 250 public airports and other public landing areas in the United States and its Territories and possessions, determined by the Administrator with the approval of a board composed of the Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of Commerce to be necessary for national defense, including areas essential for safe approaches and including the acquisition of land, \$40,000,000, of which \$2,000,000 shall be available for general administrative expenses, including the objects specified in section 204 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and including engineering services and supervision of construction: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be construed as precluding the use of other appropriations available for any of the purposes for which this appropriation is made.

This last provision is made necessary by the fact that under the W. P. A. program W. P. A. funds may be used for airport improvement. Without such a provision in the bill there might have been discontinued such airport development and improvement as is being carried on with W. P. A. funds.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICHOLS. Is it contemplated by the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses that this is only the beginning of this thing, and that probably the program in order to be fully developed will require further study and there will probably be subsequent appropriations to carry out the airport program?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would not be able to say to the gentleman that the Appropriations Committees had any idea that there would be a further program. However, I think that matter would have to stand on its merits. I believe this speaks for itself. If the facts demonstrate that in connection with the airplane program and the defense program an enlargement or an expansion of this is necessary, the way would be wide open to consider it.

Mr. NICHOLS. A recent survey showed that throughout the country there is an inadequate supply of airports for the number of airplanes we are talking about, and airports are a very vital part of the program.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I quite agree with the gentleman. It was the unanimous opinion of the conferees that such a program would be sufficient to embark upon for the present. Let the future take care of itself.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. In the list of airports which would be eligible for participation in this program, filed with the committee, there were 3,981 airports, I believe. They were classified as defense projects and nondefense projects, to show those necessary for national defense. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that only those airports which had the

approval of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Commerce as being necessary for national defense could participate in this program?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct. They have to have the O. K. of that board.

Mr. ENGEL. They must be necessary for defense?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I could not quite understand the language the gentleman read, but do I correctly understand that this \$40,000,000 is to be spent by contracting with contracting firms to build these airports, or is it to be used for the W. P. A.?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is not to be used for the W. P. A. However, there would be no objection to the use of W. P. A. labor on these projects. W. P. A. labor might be used, but there is nothing to require it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is it the idea that this \$40,000,000 is to be used through contracts negotiated with contractors to build or improve these airports?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is mainly correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HAWKS. What is the gentleman's understanding of the term "public airport"?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Just what the term implies; that it is operated by some public agency such as the Federal Government, a State, city, or some political subdivision or agency thereof.

Mr. HAWKS. That would mean county airports and city airports?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICHOLS. I presume this program is broad enough that it contemplates the construction of airports to be used, for instance, for C. A. A. student training and airports to be used for the program of Army training of civilian student pilots?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That portion of it was stricken out.

Mr. NICHOLS. This, then, is strictly military, and this appropriation will be used only for the Army and the Navy?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would not say they could not be used by other people. These funds could not be used to improve them, but I think the airport might be used; for instance, you might have a publicly operated airport in a community that the Army wished to develop as an emergency landing field for Army planes. If this board certified that that was necessary for national-defense purposes, funds could be used to develop that and it would not in any way interfere with whatever civil functions were being carried on there in the way of a training program, but they could not improve the field for the primary purpose of carrying on a training program.

Mr. NICHOLS. Neither for C. A. A. nor the Army?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Certainly not for the C. A. A.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. As I understand it, before the House Appropriation Subcommittee is this list of the Civil Aeronautics Authority of something like 4,000 locations for projects for airport improvements, and so forth, and under the justification heading there is found in many cases the letter "N," which means national defense as distinguished from air-school training and such.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. CHURCH. That complete list amounts to something like \$700,000,000. However, the designations "N" for national defense, of course, are much less in number. Now, the gentleman says that in the conference report there is authorized not to exceed 250 projects. Would the gentleman say that he is able to point to that list before his committee where the projects are labeled "N," meaning national defense under the heading "Justification," and that these 250 projects are taken from that list or would the gentleman say that those projects labeled "For National Defense," and maybe other locations as well, will still have to be submitted to this Board, consisting of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Commerce for its approval?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would not say either one.

Mr. CHURCH. In other words, where do you find any one of those projects that make up a list not to exceed 250?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If I may have the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I would like to see whether the gentleman concurs in the construction I am going to give the gentleman from Illinois of this list that has been filed.

Mr. CHURCH. Where do we go to find the location of any of these 250 projects?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. So far as I know, I could not name a single airport that would be in the so-called 250 category. Here is the way it was arrived at. In the first place, the list filed with the Appropriations Committee was a survey made by the Civil Aeronautics Authority, a prospective list, just looking over the country as a whole to see what might be done if, when, and as Congress wished to embark upon such a program. Now, so far as this bill is concerned, that list is laid aside. We had a letter before the conferees from Mr. Jesse Jones, the Secretary of Commerce, urging the appropriation of these funds for airport development, and he said that in his opinion, with this \$80,000,000 program, 200 to 300 needed projects could be carried on. He did not say what projects, and there was no list of locations. So the conferees, in order to get away from the idea that this was embarking upon a 4,000-airport project, adopted the suggestion of the Secretary of Commerce, that a limited number of airports would be considered for development or improvement when they had the sanction and the recommendation of this Board that is set up in the bill, but not over 250.

Mr. CHURCH. So it would be a fair statement to say that under the terms of the conference report projects not to exceed 250 would be selected by the Board, the Board to stay within the \$40,000,000 appropriation, and also that this Board, composed of the Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of Commerce, can even ignore the 4,000-project list that is before your committee, which totals around \$700,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There may be none of the 250 in that list or there may be one or many. It was my understanding that each one would stand on its own merits and each one would have to have the sanction of this Board.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do I understand that the selections are made by the Administrator or the C. A. A.?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. By the Administrator, with the approval of this Board, composed of the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. NICHOLS. When the gentleman says "with the approval," I presume that any of them might suggest, and then all of them would have to agree. The selection does not have to be made by the Administrator of the C. A. A. or by the Secretary of War or by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. NICHOLS. Any of them may do that?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, all three of them have to agree on it before it can be done.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. All of them have to concur before it is an approved project.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. In reference to vocational education, as I understand, the money that was requested by the National Youth Administration for vocational education is to be spent by the Office of Education and not by the Youth Administration.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The part of it that is for the training program is to be under the Office of Education. That part that is for the work projects is to be carried on by the National Youth Administration.

Mr. RICH. How do you define the difference?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The amounts are divided in the bill.

Mr. PACE. That was not changed?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There is some slight change made in the language.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONNERY. I have in my mind an airport in my district which is being improved under a W. P. A. project, municipally sponsored. Should that particular airport be selected as one vital to national defense by this Board and approved, can the gentleman tell us what arrangement will be made in such instance?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The Board would have the right to approve that for such additional improvements as it felt necessary.

Mr. CONNERY. But the project would continue on as municipally sponsored?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. This \$40,000,000 will probably be used in much the same manner that the \$25,000,000 that has already been granted to increase the Federal participation now in W. P. A.?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The \$40,000,000 does not in any way interfere with the W. P. A. program. They can go along together.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. With reference to the W. P. A. amount, as I understand it, the W. P. A. amounts are available in addition to the \$40,000,000 in this conference report. Are the W. P. A. amounts for airports placed by this conference report to be under this same Board?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No, it does not interfere with the W. P. A. program at all. That is the reason we put the proviso in there. But where a community has a W. P. A. project in progress it does not interfere with that at all. However, if this Board determined that that airport should have further improvement in order to permit the landing of large bombing planes, they might take some of this \$40,000,000 to provide additional runways.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. But is not a penalty placed upon that municipality, inasmuch as the municipality is making a contribution under the W. P. A. project?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not think so. Many municipalities have had W. P. A. projects.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the gentleman have time to read the language put in by the Senate?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I just read it into the RECORD. Would the gentleman please take the conference report and look at it?

Now, Mr. Speaker, just one additional word before I reserve the balance of my time.

With the adoption of this conference report the work of the Appropriations Committee at this session of Congress, so far as I know, will be concluded. [Applause.] At least, I hope it will be.

In my 18 years of service in the House and 10 years of service on the Appropriations Committee I have never encountered the amount of detailed work that has been laid on the doorstep of the Appropriations Committee. We have been in session almost continuously since right after Thanksgiving. Many times when the House was in recess and in vacation period, the Appropriations Committee and subcommittees were at work. My colleagues in the majority on the committee have had the primary responsibility for this work and have labored together in harmony and diligence and each Member deserves the thanks of the House and of the country for this painstaking and patriotic service. The clerks have worked with no vacations—day and night and Sundays and holidays.

I want also to pay my respects and express my appreciation to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and other minority members of the Appropriations Committee, the whole committee as well as this subcommittee.

In a large amount of work of this kind naturally there have been many places where there has been very marked differences of opinion about procedure and about the wisdom of this or that, but I can say that all of it has been handled in a spirit of good sportsmanship and with a desire, so far as I could tell, of trying to do the best thing for the country, trying to do the best thing for this defense program which has been so close to the hearts of all of us. We could not have carried through this defense program as expeditiously as we have carried it through had it not been for the splendid cooperation of the minority members of the Appropriations Committee. [Applause.] There have been many times and many places where there might have been dilatory tactics resorted to and technicalities and technical objections made that would have tied us up into knots, but almost without exception as far as the work of the Appropriations Committee is concerned, we have had the patriotic cooperation of the minority members.

I think it is only just and right that such a statement should be made upon the floor of this House, and I am very glad to make it. [Applause.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very much interested, as are all Members from Massachusetts and New England in the appropriation for the drydock at Boston. Is that in the bill today? The appropriation should be made for the drydock to go ahead with it at once. It is strategically located, and there is an exceptionally skilled and large group of labor available.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That appropriation has not been made.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman very much for his information, but I regret deeply that no money has been appropriated. It is discrimination against Massachusetts.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time, and I yield 10 minutes now to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this bill represents about \$228,000,000 in direct appropriations and about \$10,250,000 of contract authorizations, in addition to funds that have been previously appropriated.

I am not going to dwell on the question of the Civil Aeronautics Authority money for airports. I never had any idea that the Civil Aeronautics expected in any way to build most of the 3,900 or 4,000 airports that were contained in the list that was made public. My understanding is that this study was made public by inadvertence in the C. A. A. offices and that that is what the C. A. A. first reported to Members of Congress, although now they state that the publication of it was the work of the Appropriations Committee. But that is a minor matter.

There could have been no excuse for funds of this size and magnitude unless the money was for national defense at this time. The limitation of that money to that particular pur-

pose is undoubtedly proper and the determination of where it should be spent upon that basis is proper.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Is the use of these moneys limited to national defense?

Mr. TABER. It must be determined by the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of Commerce that the airport is necessary for national defense in order for it to qualify for expenditure. On the list there were a large number of airports designated as qualifying for the purpose by the Civil Aeronautics Authority, probably two or three, and maybe four in each State. Those were the airports on which the Civil Aeronautics Authority Board had recommended large expenditures running anywhere from \$300,000 to \$700,000.

Mr. REED of New York. I am interested because when that report went out it stirred many of my communities and cities into action believing they were going to get an airport, hearing that their names were on the list; and I just wanted to know the facts. I assume from what the gentleman states that in order to get those airports it will be necessary for them to show that they are essential to national defense.

Mr. TABER. That is the understanding. I think I stated on the floor when the bill was up that very few of these places that were named in the list would receive airports out of this appropriation. I did not attempt to say it would be entirely limited to national defense, but that is the program the Secretary of Commerce recommended, and that the conferees adopted.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I have received similar requests from people in my district. Is that list available to the membership of the House?

Mr. TABER. Yes; it is available any time the gentleman wants to see it. I have a copy, and the gentleman can see a copy in the Appropriations Committee room.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Why not put it in the RECORD?

Mr. TABER. It is too big a document to put in the RECORD.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I am interested in these huge expenditures which we are told are for airports for national defense. Only a few weeks ago I spent half a day talking to a personal friend of mine, a pilot who had just returned from Europe where he had flown as an active pilot for about 5 years. He stated that insofar as national defense is concerned an airport which does not have some underground camouflaged and hidden hangars and runways is about as worthless in time of war as old Civil War muzzle-loading guns would be to men going over the top to take a modern machine-gun nest. I call attention to these facts in the interest of national defense. The Congress should realize that the expansive and expensive Gravelly Point airport adjacent to the Nation's Capital and all other airports in the country do not have a single underground, hidden, or camouflaged runway or hangar although more than \$14,000,000 of public funds have already been expended for the Gravelly Point airport.

I ask the gentleman if it is contemplated in the construction and improvement of airports with funds provided for in this large appropriation whether they will be built for national defense or whether they will only be political pork-barrel airports? Will they have hidden, underground, or camouflaged runways and hangars?

Mr. TABER. We can only hope that the airports will not be political footfalls. The second matter has not been gone into by our committee. The question was not raised until after the bill was reported out.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman may have answered this question, but as I understand it there is practically nothing to that list of all these airports that were to be established that created such a stir several weeks ago.

Mr. TABER. No, not in legislation pending at the present time.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Now let me ask the gentleman this question, and I assure him I do not expect to hold him to any definite facts, but can he tell us about what amount of money this Congress has appropriated for airports, definitely appropriated for airports?

Mr. TABER. We have not provided for any airports except the Army and Navy airports. I cannot give the figure. The only other airport money that would be available would be what would result from the bill now before us.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I may say that in conversation this afternoon with a gentleman who speaks for the Civil Aeronautics Authority it is my understanding that the interdepartmental committee that will be appointed after this bill becomes a law will make a survey of all proposed and existing airports. This survey will be conducted from the standpoint of national defense. Where the need for national defense exists this money will apply, but at no other place.

Mr. TABER. I think that is correct.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. Is there any airport that is now officially approved that comes under the provisions of this appropriation?

Mr. TABER. I do not know. I do not quite understand what the gentleman means by approved. There is no airport specifically named for which these funds are available. If by "approved" the gentleman means of an approved type, I think there are some airports of that character, but I would not undertake myself to supply the answer, because I lack the information.

Mr. THOMASON. I am sure certain types have been approved, and that specifications have been drawn for different types. But let me ask with reference to this list which has created so much confusion, there is not a single one of those airports that has been officially approved and the money specifically appropriated for it, is there?

Mr. TABER. Absolutely there is no allocation of any amount whatever, not a dollar of this \$40,000,000 that is carried here in this conference report.

Mr. THOMASON. Then are we not safe in assuring our constituents who have become excited about that situation that none will be officially approved and the money specifically appropriated until the joint interdepartmental board has investigated and specifically given its approval. Is that right?

Mr. TABER. We might say that until and unless this joint committee that is going to be appointed picks out an airport as needed for national defense none of this \$40,000,000 will be available for that airport.

Mr. THOMASON. Not to deceive the people in these communities mentioned in this list, we could tell them that they cannot rely upon that report because that money has not yet been appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. TABER. This money will have been appropriated as soon as the conference report is agreed to and the bill signed by the President, but none of it will be available for the construction or improvement of any airport or landing field until these three departments certify that the airport or landing field is necessary for national defense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. As a practical matter, can we not answer our constituents in this way: That this money is appropriated for national defense to be used in such places for airport development as the experts who are responsible for our national defense tell us it should be used, and that we as Members of Congress have no business, and we have no right to insist on the location of any airport in our respective districts, simply because we want to get something from the Government for nothing? The publication of that list of prospective airports was most unfortunate.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Will this interdepartmental committee have power to determine the location and the type of these airports or is it simply a matter of making a recommendation?

Mr. TABER. Absolutely. It must have their approval or it cannot be done.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. As I understand, this bill provides for either the construction or improvement of 250 airports?

Mr. TABER. Not to exceed 250.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Was not the \$25,000,000 in the W. P. A. bill for the improvement of airports?

Mr. TABER. I cannot remember exactly, but I think that is correct.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. That is a total of \$65,000,000 for not to exceed 250 airports?

Mr. TABER. The \$25,000,000 is not limited to those 250 airports.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Your committee must have reviewed this matter pretty carefully. How many airports and how much money is involved in a national defense that has quadrupled our airplanes, not cutting down on the use of our commercial planes, and that will therefore give us need for about four times the number of airports we have now? What is the provision, before we leave here, for airports for national defense?

Mr. TABER. There is no provision that I know of except the regular appropriations in the Army and Navy bills for airports for national defense, with the exception of what is carried here and whatever might be used of the \$25,000,000 carried in the W. P. A. bill. There are large appropriations for airplanes, and I may say there will be in the Army and Navy at least 10,000 training planes that will be flying around one place or another before the end of the present fiscal year, because those planes are easily and quickly built, and can be built by some of the smaller factories quite rapidly and made available for training purposes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to inquire about two other items in this bill. I refer to page 14, the National Youth Administration. Do I understand from this language now that the \$30,500,000 provided there will be placed in the hands of the State office of education and that this training program will be taken out of the hands of the Federal Government?

Mr. TABER. The technical training will be in the hands of the educational authorities in the different States, although the so-called incidental employment that may be given to the National Youth beneficiaries will be under the National Youth Administration, but their training and schooling will be under the regular school authorities.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On page 28, there is an item of \$18,250 for some kind of improvement in the living quarters of the High Commissioner to the Philippines. Are these additions that we have made to the new palace we recently built over there?

Mr. TABER. I expect it is. I do not know. I do not like that item myself.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I want the record to show that the \$25,000,000 in the relief bill allotted to national-defense projects is not necessarily to be allotted to airport development. It may be used for other national-defense purposes.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. And it should not be assumed it is all for aviation.

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. On page 42, under the heading "Coast Guard" the House appropriation was increased to the extent of \$812,000 by the Senate, which item is for the building of ship ways at the Curtis Bay depot. This was in accordance with the Budget recommendation and I expressed at the time the bill was being considered by the House my disappointment in the fact the committee did not see fit to include it in its recommendations. I am glad now to be advised by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], that the conferees have agreed with the Senate amendment. The ship ways will therefore be built.

Mr. TABER. We are hoping it will work out all right.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is the provision still in the bill concerning the Bituminous Coal Commission, and I refer to the deficiency appropriation?

Mr. TABER. I do not think there is any Senate amendment with reference to that.

Mr. Speaker, with this bill we have appropriated in direct appropriations, including permanent appropriations, a total for this session of Congress of \$20,107,000,000. The following table shows the appropriations and funds otherwise made available for expenditure at this session of congress, viz:

Direct appropriations.....	\$15,768,339,250.12
Reappropriations.....	81,099,718.00
Permanent appropriations.....	3,965,049,289.00
Appropriations out of R. F. C. funds.....	277,000,000.00
Special funds.....	15,869,750.00
<hr/>	
Total cash appropriations.....	20,107,358,007.12
Contract authorizations.....	3,596,699,511.00
R. F. C. loans:	
To war industry.....	1,000,000,000.00
To South America.....	500,000,000.00
<hr/>	
Total available in all ways.....	25,204,057,518.12

Of which about \$13,800,000,000 is for alleged national defense.

On Monday I am going to give a break-down of all these items for each department of the Government so that everybody may see just what the money has been provided for.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman also put in the RECORD at that time the Treasury figures, if he has them, on the total estimated income of the Government during this fiscal year and the amount necessary to be borrowed, together with the estimated national debt after this amount has been spent?

Mr. TABER. I shall do that, and be glad to do it.

Mr. Speaker, there have been large appropriations for national defense. One thing happened yesterday that rather disturbed me. The Attorney General rendered an opinion which declares it illegal for contracts to be let, and makes invalid, I understand, all the contracts that have been let for national defense to a very large number of industries, any industries which have an order of any kind against them by the National Labor Relations Board, even if it is under appeal, under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act. This will stop the contracts that are outstanding by probably 30 percent. In my opinion, this ruling of the

Attorney General is not good law. To satisfy people that it is not good law, it is hardly necessary to do much more than cite the fact that an attempt was made to confine contracts to those who had had no ruling made against them. They would not have tried that if the law now provided for it. The Attorney General has sabotaged the defense program. If a Republican had obstructed the national defense program the way this Attorney General has, he would be called a "fifth columnist" by the present occupant of the White House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have been through in hearings and in time on the floor practically the whole of the last 12 months on appropriation bills. We have probably had to handle more work and more money than any other committee since 1918. I have not always agreed with the majority of the committee. Sometimes I have opposed them quite vigorously. Sometimes we have had debate here on the floor. But I have come to admire and respect the members of the majority on the Deficiency Committee, Messrs. ED TAYLOR, CLIFF WOODRUM, CLARENCE CANNON, GEORGE JOHNSON, LOUIS LUDLOW, BUELL SNYDER, and EVERETT O'NEIL, more and more as I have had more contact with them, and have come to appreciate more and more the hard, sincere, and patriotic work they have been doing. [Applause.]

I wish to extend at this time my thanks and appreciation to the Members on my own side of the aisle on that committee, Messrs. DICK WIGGLESWORTH, BILL LAMBERTSON, and BILL DITTER. They have been faithful and loyal to the interests of the country as they see them. [Applause.]

It has been a hard and a trying session. It has been one where tremendous responsibilities have been placed on us. Sometimes we have had to bring in here appropriations for things which were needed and for which we could not have the usual printed hearings. In my opinion, we should not get into those things where it is necessary that national defense be protected.

In my judgment, the Deficiency Committee and the whole Appropriations Committee have discharged their duties toward this defense problem in a highly sincere and patriotic manner, and I wish at this time to pay my respects to them. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, being a member of the Appropriations Committee, I, too, feel that the members of that committee, both those on the Deficiency Committee and the other members of the committee, are just as fine men as we have in the House of Representatives, but I certainly have not agreed with the work we have done as far as appropriations are concerned. Probably I may lay it to the laws the House of Representatives has passed, which create a great demand for spending.

A few minutes ago the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] brought out the fact that we have appropriated at this session of Congress \$24,700,000,000. If you take into consideration the fact that the amount of revenues you will receive will be about \$7,500,000,000, including the two tax bills we have passed, we are going to be about \$15,000,000,000, \$16,000,000,000, or \$17,000,000,000 in the red. If the Appropriations Committee did a good job, then somebody is lax in the House of Representatives, maybe the Committee on Ways and Means, for permitting us to appropriate that enormous sum more than we are going to receive. In view of the fact that for the last 10 years we have been in the red every year from \$1,500,000,000 to \$4,000,000,000 something is going to happen. We cannot continue to go on in that way.

I want to call your attention to some of the appropriations in this bill which I contend never should have been made. The Deficiency Committee should have called in the men who

had charge of certain appropriations so that we would not have permitted these appropriations to be made.

I believe one of the greatest recommendations to the Appropriations Committee was made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], that each subdivision of the Appropriations Committee should have a man, to be paid \$10,000 a year, to keep the Appropriations Committee informed of just what was going on. If we should have such a man for each of the 10 subcommittees, and if these men were efficient and desirous of trying to keep this country within its limit of spending, it would be the cheapest money the Appropriations Committee could spend and it would be along the lines of good business.

Let me call your attention to some of these appropriations. Here is the High Commissioner of the Philippine Islands. We gave him \$750,000 to build a home in Manila and then we gave him money enough to build a home out in the suburbs. Now he comes in here and asks us to give him \$18,250 for the improvement of that house and for additional operating expenses. That money should never be appropriated and should not be included in this bill. Why they have granted that money I do not understand.

Then here is the Bonneville Power Administration. We set up a yardstick down in the T. V. A., and now we have appropriated in the War Department bill, and almost every bill this year, something for Bonneville and Grand Coulee, and we give them here \$3,850,000. We give the Bituminous Coal Commission \$137,000, the most extravagant and wasteful commission we have ever had. That money should not have been added to this bill, or at least the other members of the Appropriations Committee should have been called in and should have been considered in the appropriation of that money. Then we have the Bureau of Reclamation and a lot of other items, including the Pine River project in Colorado, involving \$400,000, and the Colorado River project involving \$2,500,000. These items could have been deferred another year. Then we have an appropriation of \$10,000 to the Jamestown Museum. This money should not be appropriated now, and I could have stricken out a lot of other items, and it would have been a mighty fine thing if they were stricken out.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for these few minutes so that I may, in my own humble, simple, and inadequate way, pay my tribute to a Member of this House whom I consider one of the most remarkable men who ever sat in the Congress during the century and a half of history of this Nation. I refer to Congressman EDWARD T. TAYLOR, of Colorado, chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives.

My colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. JOHN TABER] the ranking Republican of this great committee, of which I have the privilege of being a member, told us a few moments ago that the total appropriations and authorizations for all purposes at this session of Congress amounted to \$25,000,000,000. Two years ago I compiled the figures giving the total assessed valuation of the United States as that valuation was determined by the local assessing officers of the several States. The total assessed valuation of the 48 States was approximately \$134,000,000,000. The total appropriations and authorizations made at this session of Congress, according to the gentleman from New York, amount to almost 20 percent of that assessed valuation. I am not saying this for the purpose of criticizing, but rather to point out the tremendous task this great committee has had during the past 9 months. It is indeed remarkable that the man who has been chairman of this committee which has held hearings and passed upon this tremendous sum of money is now in his eighty-third year.

ED TAYLOR is one of the finest and most lovable characters in American history. He was graduated from the University of Michigan in 1884, and was president of his class. He

studied and worked with the famous Judge Cooley, and while working for Judge Cooley proofread that monumental legal landmark, Cooley's last edition of Blackstone. He served his State and Nation in various capacities for nearly a half a century, and is now serving his sixteenth successive term in the House of Representatives.

We of Michigan are proud that he is an alumnus of the University of Michigan, of which I have the honor of being an honorary alumnus. He brings to the House and to the committee that tremendous experience and judgment which comes with lifelong service. God has been very kind to him and showered him with many blessings and in blessing him has blessed his State and his Nation. God has permitted him to enjoy, at the age of nearly 83, the health, mental vigor, and vitality of a man of 50. The Nation has been fortunate in having in Congress and at the head of this committee a man with 83 years of life and all the experience that 83 years of clean living brings with it. It has been a rare privilege to serve with him and under him. I have learned to love him and everything that he is and has been; for his patience, his kindness, and his help. My prayer is that the Almighty God may give him many more years of life, health, and happiness. God bless you, Ed TAYLOR. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, from the remarks made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], we are to understand that an opinion rendered by the Attorney General of yesterday has invalidated practically 30 percent of the contracts that had been let for the national-defense projects. It is my opinion if that is the situation the Congress should certainly not adjourn until it has been corrected. As I understand it, the opinion has invalidated contracts where an order has been issued against firms by the National Labor Relations Board. This certainly is a problem that is of the utmost importance to national defense and the Congress will be held guilty by the country if we adjourn before that situation is corrected. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] such time as he may require.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Virginia yield for a question?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. ANGELL. Does this conference report include an item of \$4,000,000 for the completion of the turbines in the Bonneville project?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; it does.

BONNEVILLE PROJECT AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the conference report on the deficiency bill now before us for consideration, H. R. 10539, it may be recalled that when the bill was before the House recently I discussed the matter of the appropriation carried therein providing \$3,850,000 for the Department of the Interior, Bonneville Power Administration, for construction, operation, and maintenance of the Bonneville power-transmission system.

There is an additional item now included in the conference report on this bill of \$4,000,000. This appropriation was added in the Senate and is a pure precautionary defense item. It was approved by the Bureau of the Budget and sent up to the Senate by the War Department.

Does this conference report include an item of \$4,000,000 for the completion of the foundations of the remaining turbines in the Bonneville project?

Last August the Bonneville Administrator, through the Secretary of the Interior, advised the Secretary of War that it was necessary to schedule the completion of Bonneville units 7 to 10, inclusive, to meet estimated load resulting from defense and normal regional load increased. The War Department then sent the Administrator's schedule to the Portland engineer's office for information and estimate, and did not receive a return in time to have the matter presented to the House committee.

Bonneville has now 107,000 kilowatts under contract, including the 65,000 kilowatts now going to the Aluminum Co. A nationally famous industry, one of the most vital cogs in our defense program, has asked the Bonneville Administrator for 97,000 kilowatts. This load will materialize, as our airplane construction program requires this power. Seven other defense industries have asked for power reservation totaling between 200,000 and 250,000 kilowatts. If only 40 percent of these latter applications result in firm contracts, Bonneville will be short of power.

For some time I have stressed the great national weakness of our defense program, and have pointed out ways and means to correct the situation. This appropriation item is one step in such a remedial program, but we greatly need to go further. I do not believe that Congress or the American people fully realize our dependence on imported metal stock piles. Definite defense bottlenecks exist in the critical metals like nickel, manganese, chrome, and antimony. In this connection I can extend the remarks I made last May on the nickel situation. Armor plate is a nickel-steel alloy, and our entire naval program rests on the supply of nickel from one Canadian smelter. If anything happens to this one plant, armor-plate production will be retarded.

Fortunately large deposits of natural nickel-steel ore are located in Alaska, adjacent to tidewater, and can be boated at a low cost to the Bonneville area for electro-thermal reduction. Our administrative officers should immediately take steps to protect the armor-plate supply, and ample low-cost power should be available for this eventuality.

Modern metal-reduction processes depend on the electric furnace and the electric cell. The Northwest has ample supplies of basic ores and large blocks of potential hydro power. These should by all means be hitched together. For some time I have developed the basic facts in this all-important subject. Anyone who is familiar with the strategic and critical material situation will urge the development of our available supply of low-cost power. For this reason I have urged the adoption of the \$4,000,000 item, which is 100 percent recoverable under the act of August 20, 1937.

Mr. Speaker, I believe these additional appropriations to carry on toward completion the transmission facilities of the Bonneville project and complete the additional power units is a wise procedure. As I have said, the dam itself has long since been constructed, and the Federal Government has a large investment therein and we may be called on on short notice to provide increased loads of electrical energy to proceed with our defense program. We have recently appropriated \$65,000,000 for additional facilities for that purpose at the T. V. A. This additional power made available at Bonneville under these increased facilities will add materially to our power capacity, and I append as a part of my remarks certain tables which will make clear power capacity and dates available of the Bonneville project loads under the programs now authorized by the Congress.

The tables referred to are as follows:

TABLE 1.—Bonneville project installation schedule and capacity
Bonneville units

Date	Units	Installed capacity (kilowatts)			
		With suggested appropriation unit capacity	Cumulative capacity	Without suggested appropriation unit capacity	Cumulative capacity
At present.....	1 and 2....	43,200	86,400	43,200	86,400
Jan. 1, 1941.....	4.....	54,000	140,400	54,000	140,400
Jan. 15, 1941.....	3.....	54,000	194,400	54,000	194,000
Jan. 1, 1942.....	5 and 6....	54,000	302,400	54,000	302,400
July 1, 1943.....	7 and 8....	54,000	410,400	(1)	(1)
Jan. 1, 1944.....	9.....	54,000	464,400	(1)	(1)
July 1, 1944.....	10.....	54,000	518,400	(1)	(1)

¹ Completion dates for units 7, 8, 9, and 10 without suggested appropriation will depend on future appropriations, but will most probably be 1 year later than with suggested appropriation, because of time difference (Oct. 15, 1940 and July 1, 1941) and shop delays of machine manufacturers.

No allowance made in above for holding 1 unit in reserve.

Based on normal unaccelerated schedule for units 7 to 10, inclusive, and continuing appropriations for these units.

Derived from table p. 180, House hearings, first supplemental appropriation bill for 1941, corrected for change in schedule submitted by Chief of Engineers for unit 9.

TABLE 2.—Bonneville project estimated load schedule

Date	Item	Load or increase rate	Cumulative load
		Kilowatts	Kilowatts
Present.....	Executed prime contracts.....	106,850	106,850
Do.....	Contracts submitted but not executed.....	10,800	117,650
Do.....	Dump power ¹	60,000	177,650
Do.....	X company defense load ²	100,000	277,650
Do.....	Total in sight load.....		277,650
July 1, 1942.....	Estimated industrial ³	100,000	377,650
Jan. 1, 1943.....	Regional increase ⁴	82,000	459,650
July 1, 1943.....	do. ⁵	24,000	483,650
Jan. 1, 1944.....	do. ⁵	24,000	507,650
July 1, 1944.....	do. ⁵	24,000	531,650
Jan. 1, 1945.....	do. ⁵	24,000	555,650

CONCLUSIONS FROM TABLES 1 AND 2

July 1, 1941..... Installed capacity of 194,400 kilowatts. Will not take care of total in sight load. 60,000 kilowatts of dump power will have to be dropped or handled by interchange to take care of 76 percent of defense load.² No Bonneville power will be available for load.² Will have to draw on interchanges.

July 1, 1942..... Bonneville will be short of capacity about 75,000 kilowatts.

Jan. 1, 1943..... And succeeding years, with normal schedule of completion under suggested deficiency appropriation.

¹ Dump power sold to private utilities, which are short of capacity to handle their own load. For dump load see p. 183 of House hearings, less prime utility contracts listed p. 184.

² Defense load request from 1 of the principal American metal companies now supplying the bulk of metal to airplane industry—97,000-kilowatt plant load plus line loss.

³ Bonneville Administrator has preliminary reservation requests from 7 metal and chemical companies, totaling about 250,000 kilowatts. To be conservative only 40 percent of these requests was taken to represent firm contracts. This represents 100,000 kilowatts, the same as load from X company. Bonneville will not have capacity to meet any further defense load.

⁴ Yearly increase derived from table, p. 194, House hearings, and excluding load areas tributary to Grand Coulee.

⁵ Same as footnote 4 above, except calculated on 6-month basis.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS].

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the House conferees on the fact that they insisted on the \$40,000,000 remaining in this bill of the \$80,000,000 that was originally in it for the construction of airports.

I also want to state to the membership that you had just as well get ready to appropriate a great deal more than \$40,000,000 in the session to come for the construction of airports. We have a program in this country aimed at 50,000 airplanes. You would be surprised if you would make a survey of the landing facilities throughout the United States, to know that we did not have enough airports even to take care of the airplanes that we have at this time. Fifty thousand airplanes is a lot of airplanes, and it will take a whole lot more airports than we now have to accommodate them.

If I may point out one or two things to you, you know that we have only four class 4 airports in the United States for commercial purposes. A class 4 airport is simply this: It is an airport with runways of at least 5,000 feet, adequate hangar space with illumination—I mean lighting—and radio beams; only four such in the United States. When Gravelly Point is completed it will be the fifth one.

You have surprisingly few airports in the United States which will accommodate a squadron of airplanes. This program has to go on. We have not invented sky hooks yet. We must have places to land and house these airplanes.

Beyond that, we have a great training program going on. There are fields in the country today where on a single field you will have these three operations, a training program for student pilots under the C. A. A. program; you will also have the operation of a squadron of Army planes, at least. At the same airport you have from 18 to 50 scheduled commercial airplane landings there, and you might even have a training school there for the Army under one of these factory training schools—all of them working on one field and under most trying conditions; conditions that are not safe for the training of students; conditions that are not safe for the training of Army or Navy students, and certainly not safe for the landing of commercial travelers.

This thing is happening all over the country today where commercial aviation and cities have at their own expense

developed great airports in about the third class. The Army, in order to find a place to train our Army flyers comes along and literally pushes them off of the field and takes away that airport from the city in order to train our Army and Navy flyers.

So this country has to spend a lot more than \$40,000,000. This is a good start. I think it is probably as strong as we should have gone now, but in January you can just get ready to appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars for the construction of airports throughout this country, because, not having airports and having 50,000 airplanes is just the same as having a big navy and no place to dock it.

Congressman EDMISTON and myself recently obtained through the War Department an Army bomber and flew to the west coast. We then zigzagged back and forth to Washington, looking over airport facilities, or probably I should say a lack of airport facilities. On this trip we paid our own expenses so that we could return and give you first-hand information as to the inadequacy of landing and training facilities throughout the United States. We only scratched the surface but saw enough to convince us that the construction of airports throughout the United States is as much a vital part of the national-defense program as is the expansion of the Army and the Navy.

C. A. A. students should not be training on fields where there are large Army, Navy, or commercial activities. Neither should Army students, working under a factory school, such as the Spartan School in Tulsa and Muskogee, Okla., be trained where there are Army, Navy, or commercial activities.

We saw fields in California where it was so hazardous for our pilots to attempt to land our airplane, because of student flyers who did not have radio connection with a control tower, that it was necessary for us to fly to another field to land.

The largest airplane in the world is being constructed at the Douglas factory in Santa Monica, Calif., and will be known as a B-19 bomber, with a wing spread of 210 feet, a length from tip to tail of 165 feet, a gasoline capacity of 11,500 gallons. They will have to take this airplane off of the ground of an airport which has runways of only 2,500 feet.

Commercial aviation, through its development, has developed both airplanes and airports to the point that we now lead the world in this field, and it is not right that this operation should be forced off of the airports which they and local communities have developed in order to train Army, Navy, and civilian flying personnel. This system of airports must so be arranged across the United States that when this emergency is over and the Army and Navy, because of reducing their activity, no longer needs them, all of them will be ready and accessible for use in the commercial and private flying fields, which is bound to follow after this emergency has passed.

I am here, of course, only hitting the high spots in making these remarks, for the purpose of serving notice on those of you who have not stayed abreast of the rapid evolution that has taken place in aviation, that you have got to get ready to spend enormous sums of money to provide housing, landing, and training facilities for the vast number of airplanes that we have in this Congress appropriated money to build.

My conservative brethren had just as well get ready to loosen up, because if you are to remain conservative, you can only do that by providing these facilities. They are as vital as are roads to automobiles; road beds to railroads; docks and deepened channels to the steamship.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there are eight amendments in disagreement. I ask unanimous consent that

amendments numbered 11, 23, 24, 37, 43, 48, and 59 be considered in bloc. There is nothing controversial about them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 11: Page 4, line 21, insert:

"GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

"The Superintendent of Documents is hereby authorized to deliver to the Librarian of Congress, from the sales stock in the Government Printing Office, 250 sets of The Writings of George Washington, as published by the Bicentennial Commission, for distribution through international exchange and for such other distribution for the use of foreign governments as may be deemed appropriate."

Amendment No. 23: Page 17, after line 14 insert:

"Navy Department Building, Washington, D. C.: For the construction of an additional wing on the Navy Department Building and an additional story on wing No. 1 thereof under the provisions of the Public Buildings Act approved May 25, 1926, as amended, including administrative expenses in connection therewith, \$590,000: *Provided*, That the contract or contracts for such project may be entered into without advertising."

Amendment No. 24: Page 18, after line 14, insert:

"GEORGE WASHINGTON BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

"For payment to Katherine H. Claggett and to the estate of Dr. John C. Fitzpatrick \$2,700 and \$6,666.66, respectively, for services rendered the George Washington Bicentennial Commission in connection with the compilation of the definitive writings of George Washington, \$9,366.66: *Provided*, That the payment to the said Katherine H. Claggett shall be in full, complete, and final compensation of any and all claims arising out of services rendered to the George Washington Bicentennial Commission prior to June 30, 1940."

Amendment No. 37: Page 28, after line 2, insert:

"Appropriations available to the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1941 for soil and moisture conservation operations shall be available for packing, crating, and transportation, including drayage, of personal effects of employees upon permanent change of station, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior."

Amendment No. 43: Page 30, after line 23, insert:

"Eastern Cherokees: For the relief of the Eastern Cherokees, as authorized by the bill (S. 4232) entitled 'An act for the relief of the Eastern Cherokees,' Seventy-sixth Congress, fiscal year 1941, \$1,997.84, without interest and to be in full settlement of all claims of such tribe of Indians against the Government as found to be due by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1906 (202 U. S. 101)."

Amendment No. 48: Page 34, after line 18, insert:

"Legislative expenses, Territory of Alaska, 1939: The limitations in appropriations for legislative expenses, Territory of Alaska, as contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1939, and the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1939, are hereby amended to read as follows:

"For salaries of members, \$21,585; mileage of members, \$9,448.40; salaries of employees, \$5,160; printing, indexing, comparing proofs, and binding laws, printing, indexing and binding journals, stationery, supplies, printing of bills, reports, etc., \$14,458.81; in all \$50,652.21."

Amendment No. 59: Page 43, at the bottom of the page, insert:

"Removal and reestablishment of Arlington Farm, Va.: For the removal and reestablishment of the functions and activities at Arlington Farm, including the acquisition of lands by purchase or by condemnation, the construction and installation of buildings, equipment, and utilities and appurtenances thereto, including the employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$3,200,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be transferred to the credit of the Secretary of Agriculture for expenditure by him: *Provided further*, That upon the transfer of the activities of the Department of Agriculture from Arlington Farm, so much of the land thereof as may be required by the War Department shall be transferred to the control and jurisdiction of the latter Department."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the above amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the other amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 34: Page 24, after line 19, insert:

"For all necessary expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, and protection of the Washington National Airport in accordance with the act of June 29, 1940, including personal services in the District of Columbia, purchase, operation, and maintenance of one motor-propelled ambulance, one fire-and-crash truck, and one rescue fire-and-crash motorboat; purchase (including exchange), operation, and maintenance of two passenger-carrying motor vehicles; purchase of equipment, materials, and supplies, including \$700 for the purchase, cleaning, and repair of uniforms for the guards, \$152,200, and, in addition, the sum of \$103,450 is transferred to this appropriation from the appropriation 'Maintenance and operation of air-navigation facilities,' contained in the Inde-

pendent Offices Appropriation Act, 1941: *Provided*, That \$15,000 of this appropriation shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia, employed in connection with the completion of the construction of said airport, without regard to the Civil Service Act and regulations."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this amendment calls for \$255,650 for the maintenance of the Gravelly Point Airport. If your town or my town has an airport we pay for the land, we pay generally for a very considerable part of the construction of the airport, and we pay for the maintenance of the airport.

The Washington Airport cost \$14,000,000 under the direction of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the W. P. A., and the P. W. A.—three times what the investigating committee of the Committee on the District of Columbia thought should be spent for the airport at this particular site 2 years ago. Every dollar of it has come out of the Federal Government, and now it is proposed that \$255,000 be provided for the maintenance and operation of this airport for the rest of this fiscal year. I am not going to try to get a roll call on this but I am serving notice that in my opinion the District of Columbia ought to have an opportunity to pay part of the expense of operating this airport, and I believe that as we get to the proposition in future years we should provide that the District pay a good part of the operating cost of this airport.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLS. Does the gentleman know that there is a bill now pending fixing the boundary between the District of Columbia and Virginia which proposes to encompass all of the National Capital Airport in, make it a part of, and cede it to the State of Virginia?

Mr. TABER. No; I did not know that.

Mr. NICHOLS. That bill is now pending before the Committee on the District of Columbia. As the airport stands at the present time it is half in the District and half in Virginia. The boundary line runs through the middle of it. That portion which was reclaimed from the river is in the District of Columbia, the other portion is in the State of Virginia. The National Capital Parks and Planning Commission introduced a bill to place it all in Virginia. I have offered an amendment to this bill to put it all in the District of Columbia where it belongs.

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

Mr. NICHOLS. And in that case I agree with the gentleman that the District should provide the money for its upkeep.

Mr. TABER. Undoubtedly it should contribute a large part. I hope the gentleman's bill passes.

Mr. NICHOLS. The other bill would give it all to Virginia.

Mr. TABER. Then Virginia should pay the cost of its operation.

Mr. NICHOLS. No; Virginia wants to collect the taxes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very much shocked that there is no appropriation for the drydock at Boston. I feel that Boston is being severely discriminated against in not being given money for this drydock. Was it because the Budget did not submit an estimate? I know the Budget is the President so far as appropriations are concerned, but did they not submit an estimate? I cannot understand why we failed to get this appropriation.

Mr. TABER. I do not remember that there was a Budget estimate. My understanding is there was not. I will, however, check on this before my remarks are printed. My understanding is there was no Budget estimate for it. I know none was cut.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is a discrimination which ought not to be, for unless we take care of our drydock facilities we will find ourselves in the position of having ships but no docks for them. If we had the drydocks at

Boston, some of the mistakes that have been made elsewhere by the Navy Department in the ships such as building ships that will not stay upright and sending out of ships with inadequate equipment would not be made.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Referring again to the National Capital Airport and the matter of jurisdiction, one important question to be considered in this connection is that of gasoline taxes.

Mr. TABER. It would be important; yes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska to ask a question.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the courtesy of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia in yielding to me. I should like to ask him just one question concerning the conference report item of \$40,000,000 for airports to be allocated upon the authority of the interdepartmental board to be set up acting in conjunction with the Civil Aeronautics Authority for the improvement of existing airport facilities in cities throughout the country. The inquiry which I should like to make is whether this money is available to the cities for the purchase of land, or whether it is limited to other purposes?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is not available to the cities, but these funds may be used by this joint board whenever they determine it is necessary for a defense project. I would say to the gentleman from Nebraska that those instances would be very rare and would be where there was no community or city nearby which could purchase and furnish the land for their airport. It would not be considered that this board would use this fund to buy land in cities for the purpose of building airports.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. One further question, if the gentleman will bear with me. The city of Omaha, my home city in my district, at the present time is planning to hold an election to vote a substantial bond issue for the purpose of securing by purchase additional land to be added to the present airport. Does the gentleman believe that the money involved in this bill, the \$40,000,000 or any part of it, would be available to the city of Omaha for the purchase of land as an addition to existing airport facilities?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I should think in the case of a city like Omaha that it would not be. Were it a case where this board should find that the local community could not buy its own land it might, but in the case of a splendid city like Omaha it would be expected that the city would furnish the land.

Mr. LUDLOW. If the gentleman will permit, it is all predicated upon national defense.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; it is all predicated upon the question of national defense.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Perhaps the gentleman has just answered one question I had in mind when I rose. Is the determination of the location of these airports, or their need of improvement, made solely on the basis of national defense, or does it take into consideration also the facilitation of commerce?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is confined to national defense.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that this \$40,000,000 can be used as sponsorship funds under a W. P. A. project, and if so used would it not provide upward of \$150,000,000 or \$200,000,000 worth of airport work?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They can work together with the W. P. A., the C. C. C., or any of those other agencies.

Mr. MONRONEY. This \$40,000,000 will be used as sponsorship money?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would not like to term it "sponsorship" money. They will have to work out their cooperation with the W. P. A., C. C. C., and other public agencies, Federal and non-Federal.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made here today and to insert a table that I referred to when I had the floor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

IMPROVEMENT OF CERTAIN RIVERS AND HARBORS IN THE INTEREST OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 9972) authorizing the improvement of certain rivers and harbors in the interest of the national defense, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if it would be possible for the gentleman to have the House take this bill up at this time? If it goes to conference it will be delayed, and this bill should be passed now.

It contains an amendment introduced in the Senate by Senator NORRIS for an authorization for the Harlan County Dam, also known as the Republican City Dam, on the Republican River in Nebraska, according to House Document 842, Seventy-sixth Congress. This proposal is very meritorious. It would authorize an appropriation to be made for an on-river dam near the town of Republican City. This dam has been approved by the district engineer, the division engineer, and the Chief of Engineers.

Last spring the Flood Control Committee, of which I am a member, held exhaustive hearings on this proposal. The committee favored it and reported it out to this House. This dam should be built now.

I wish that I could impress upon the House the great need out in that part of Nebraska. They have been waiting for some flood-control work on this river for a long time. Many lives have been lost and millions of dollars' worth of property destroyed. On previous occasions I have told the House of the needs of this valley.

This dam will provide for water storage for irrigation in four Nebraska counties and some in Kansas. It is right in the drought area and the Dust Bowl. Those people have not raised a crop for 7 long years.

If our experience in the last World War in regard to the production of food is any criterion, the construction of this dam would play a great part in our national-defense program.

This dam will also give great protection to Kansas City, Kans., and Kansas City, Mo. These great cities, with their railroads, public utilities, airports, and national-defense industries, are a most important part of the national-defense works of this country. The Norris amendment should go through.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not think this bill can go through without going to the conference committee.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand an amendment has been placed in this bill by the Senate which has to do with the authorization of a dam in the State of Nebraska, in the district of my colleague the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. I feel that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], who has worked so diligently on this particular project, should have an opportunity to say something about the matter at this particular time. I shall not object to the request, however.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. GAVAGAN, Mr. PARSON, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. DONDERO.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report may be considered and acted upon without delay upon being filed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

Mr. LESINSKI filed the following conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 9980, to revise and codify the nationality laws of the United States into a comprehensive nationality code:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9980) to revise and codify the nationality laws of the United States into a comprehensive nationality code, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 3.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of inserting the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert on page 92 of the House bill, between lines 10 and 11, the following:

"Sec. 503. If any person who claims a right or privilege as a national of the United States is denied such right or privilege by any Department or agency, or executive official thereof, upon the ground that he is not a national of the United States, such person, regardless of whether he is within the United States or abroad, may institute an action against the head of such Department or agency in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia or in the district court of the United States for the district in which such person claims a permanent residence for a judgment declaring him to be a national of the United States. If such person is outside the United States and shall have instituted such an action in court, he may, upon submission of a sworn application showing that the claim of nationality presented in such action is made in good faith and has a substantial basis, obtain from a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States in the foreign country in which he is residing a certificate of identity stating that his nationality status is pending before the court, and may be admitted to the United States with such certificate upon the condition that he shall be subject to deportation in case it shall be decided by the court that he is not a national of the United States. Such certificates of identity shall not be denied solely on the ground that such person has lost a status previously had or acquired as a national of the United States; and from any denial of an application for such certificate the applicant shall be entitled to an appeal to the Secretary of State, who, if he approves the denial, shall state in writing the reasons for his decision. The Secretary of State, with approval of the Attorney General, shall prescribe rules and regulations for the issuance of certificates of identity as above provided."

And on page 92 of the House bill, line 11, strike out "Sec. 503" and insert "Sec. 504"; and on page 98 of the House bill, line 5, strike out "Sec. 504" and in lieu thereof insert "Sec. 505"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN LESINSKI,
CHARLES KRAMER,
EDWARD H. REES,
JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,

Managers on the part of the House.

L. B. SCHWELLENBACH,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9980) to revise and codify the nationality laws of the United States into a comprehensive nationality code, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment no. 1: The purpose of this amendment was to make it clear that the term "national of the United States" does not include an alien. The House recedes.

Amendment no. 2: This amendment amended the second paragraph of section 205, relating to the acquisition by illegitimate children of the nationality held by their mothers at the time of

their birth, to make it clear that the provisions of the paragraph are applicable with respect to children born before as well as after the effective date of the act. The House recedes.

Amendment no. 3: This amendment related to the eligibility for naturalization of Filipinos, and provided that Filipinos with full civil-service ranking who had been in the service for at least three years might be eligible for naturalization. The Senate recedes.

Amendment no. 4: This amendment provided that citizens of the United States who have lost their citizenship by reason of service in the armed forces of a foreign state might regain their American citizenship by naturalization, and that in the naturalization of such persons compliance with some of the provisions of the naturalization laws will be waived. The House recedes.

Amendment no. 5: This amendment provided that persons claiming the rights or privileges of nationals of the United States might petition the district courts of the United States for judgments declaring them to be such nationals. It provided further that any such person who is beyond the jurisdiction of the United States and has filed such petition might obtain from the appropriate consular officer a certificate of identity entitling him to entry into the United States. The House recedes with amendments which make a number of clarifying changes in the text of the Senate amendment and provide for the issuance of the certificates of identity only upon an application showing that the claim of nationality is made in good faith and has a substantial basis. The conference agreement also provides for appeals to the Secretary of State from denials of application for such certificates of identity. The conference agreement transposes the text of this amendment to a more appropriate place in the bill and also makes the necessary corrections in section numbers.

Amendment no. 6: This amendment provided that in registering aliens arriving in the United States, the fingerprints of such aliens shall be required in addition to the other information which is required under the bill. The House recedes.

Amendment no. 7: The House bill provided that a national of the United States should lose his nationality by entering, or serving in, the armed forces of a foreign state unless expressly authorized by the laws of the United States. The Senate amendment provided that he should lose his United States nationality in such a case only if he has or acquires the nationality of the foreign state. The House recedes.

Amendment no. 8: This amendment provides that, in addition to the other reasons specified in the bill, a national of the United States shall lose his nationality by committing any act of treason against, or attempting by force to overthrow or bearing arms against the United States, provided he is convicted thereof by a court martial or by a court of competent jurisdiction. The House recedes.

Amendment no. 9: This is a change in cross references made necessary by amendment no. 8. The House recedes.

Amendment no. 10: The House bill provided that a person who has become a national by naturalization and who would otherwise lose his nationality by residing in a foreign state for a period of years shall not lose his nationality if he resides abroad to represent an American commercial or financial organization. The Senate amendment added "business organization". The House recedes.

Amendment no. 11: This amendment makes clarifying changes in the provision of the House bill which provides that the wife, husband, or child of an American citizen, who is residing abroad for the purpose of being with such American citizen, shall not lose his citizenship in those cases where the American citizen spouse or parent may reside abroad without losing his nationality. The House recedes.

JOHN LESINSKI,
CHARLES KRAMER,
EDWARD H. REES,
JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on the bill H. R. 9980 just filed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman give us a little time to discuss this?

Mr. LESINSKI. We will have an hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the whole report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman expect to give us a little time on this?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] will control an hour.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is what I thought. If he was going to be arbitrary and not give us any time, we would object now. I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an exceptionally fine address presented to the Accounting Section Convention at Green Lake, Wis., by Mr. C. E. Kohlhepp, vice president of the Wisconsin Public Service Corporation, Milwaukee, Wis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a recommendation for a loyalty crusade through music for 1940-41 by Mrs. Helen Harrison Mills, of Peoria, Ill., chairman of the International Music Relations Committee of the National Federation of Music Clubs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short article by Westbrook Pegler.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks an article from the Radio and Electrical Union News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for about 5 minutes I ask that the House indulge me while I discuss the frailties of the human memory; the vagaries of a mind which forgets; the necessitous urge which leads a political leader suddenly to change from an enemy of organized labor to pose as its solicitous friend.

Mr. Willkie, the Republican standard bearer, cooed his friendship for labor in his speech at Pittsburgh last night. I desire to give another side to that picture—and the time is almost coincident with the date on which Mr. Wendell Willkie, president of the Commonwealth & Southern, was chosen as the Republican standard bearer.

I shall read from the Radio and Electrical Union News—published by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor in the second half of July, the following dispatch, dated Tallahassee, Ala.:

[From the Radio and Electrical Union News of July 1940]

ALABAMA POWER WORKERS REAFFIRM DETERMINATION—COMPANY UNION BATTERIES AND PLUG-UGLY BOSSES FAIL TO SHAKE COURAGE OF LOCAL UNION 904—LAW FLOUTED BY WILLKIE UTILITY

TALLASSEE, ALA.—Still one of the blackest spots on the utility map, the Alabama Power Co. continues its incessant war on organized labor. The company is a unit of the vast Commonwealth & Southern, a huge holding corporation, of which, until his very recent resignation, Wendell L. Willkie, former Democrat and now Republican nominee for Presidency of the United States, was chairman of the board of directors.

Whether Willkie is at fault or not is beside the question. Undoubtedly, if he is interested in labor at all, he might very easily rectify the deplorable situation now existing on this power system.

SIX YEARS CONTINUOUS

The battle for labor recognition on this property has been raging for about 6 years, has run the gamut of every device conceived in the minds of labor-hating bosses to destroy all semblance of democracy, company unionism has run rampant, the Labor Relations Act

has been flouted and laughed at, Labor Board orders have been ignored or corrupted by the tycoons, and plug-uglies have incited riotous conditions to discredit union affiliation.

"Even in this year 1940," states an observer, "men are forced to face the same brutal conditions on this company's property that were thought to be wiped out decades ago."

"Just a few instances will serve to show the deplorable treatment meted out to those who dare to exercise their right to join a union of their own choosing."

UNION MEMBER SLUGGED

"A steam-plant superintendent, notorious for his slave driving and labor baiting, slugged a union member who dared to resent being falsely labeled a thief. A hydro plant foreman threatened to knock another union member on the head when the member offered some constructive criticism of the foreman's faulty work. The known presence of company spies keeps everyone on nerve's edge, and the widespread enmity of bosses for union members has reduced efficiency to a low ebb."

"In addition to all of this, the company is still resisting an order to refund dues deducted from the pay roll for the support of a company union, condemned as illegal under provisions of the Labor Act. The amount due is in excess of \$10,000."

"This battle, provoked and continued by the company since 1934, is probably the most outrageous antiunion campaign in recent history. But I. B. E. W. Local Union 904 continues to hold the fort for organized labor. We shall win."

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I need point the moral. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHANNON].

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the debate this morning. I am afraid the readers of the RECORD will get the impression from the critical articles read into the RECORD concerning the candidates, and the expressions on the other side, that a mantle of sacrosanctity has been put about the candidates for President. I believe it ill becomes this House to indulge in that kind of claptrap, going to extremes either on one side or the other.

I want to go back to show you that that never was the rule in this country. Let me take first that great statesman, America's supreme statesman, Thomas Jefferson. The John Jay treaty was up, and he said of the President at that time, George Washington, words to this effect, "Damn his good intentions if he is going to destroy this Republic." His exact words were: "Curses on his virtues; they have undone his country." That sort of criticism, now as then, is good Americanism. It came from the greatest statesman this or any other country has ever produced. I know there is no man of Jefferson's size in this House today.

Now I come a little closer home. I followed the speakers this morning, and I could not help but think of a beautiful thing said by a President who was born in Kentucky. Jefferson Davis and this man were born almost alongside of each other. This President, in a speech delivered as a Representative in this House, a great indictment of James K. Polk, then President of the United States, said:

Mr. President, you have not fired a shot on American soil. They were all fired on foreign soil.

Further in that speech he said this:

Military glory, the attractive rainbow that rises in showers of blood, that serpent's eye that charms to destroy.

That speech was made on January 12, 1848, by Abraham Lincoln. He criticized a President. I say that we have not only a right to criticize a President but we have a duty to criticize Presidents or candidates.

I can take one of the candidates and I believe I can show that the House of Morgan is back of him. You have heard of the House of Rothschild that profited so terrifically in the Napoleonic wars. I know who put you into the other war, the first World War. It was the House of Morgan. The astounding thing in America today is that both candidates are just as one on the question of so-called selective service. Four newspapers are published in this city. Jefferson said of newspapers:

The first aid to promoting war, the newspaper.

The four newspapers in this city urged upon you, the Members of Congress, adoption of the selective service,

so-called, and every one of them today is calling it a conscription act. One of them a day or so ago went so far as to say editorially:

Don't fool the people longer, this is a war act.

I say, let us give heed, if giving heed is a protection to the American citizen who has to go out and face this thing. If we have to speak lightly about the House of Morgan and the candidates, then there is surely a degeneracy on the part of this, the people's body, because if the American youth does not have representation here, he does not have it any place. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and on looking them over I find there are two very brief quotations that I would like to include. I therefore ask unanimous consent to put them in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Los Angeles Times of Sunday, September 29.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, all of us who have been following this legislation appreciate that it is a very complicated matter. The Immigration Committee of the House for years has been struggling with the proposition of recodifying the nationality laws, and I believe that under the direction of my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], and the other members of that committee, they have done a very fine job. We passed the bill here in the House after a good deal of discussion and it went to the Senate and they have added some very important amendments. The conferees have accepted some of the amendments and rejected others. I want to compliment the House conferees on their stand in refusing to concur in some of these proposed amendments, but there are two amendments in which they have concurred that I do not quite understand and I would like to take the time to secure a little explanation of them.

I have before me Senate amendment No. 4 and it would be of no use for me to read it to the House because it is so complicated that no one could understand it by reading it once or even reading it 10 times, and to give you a sample I will read a part of it:

A person who shall have been a citizen of the United States and also a national of a foreign state, and who shall have lost his citizenship of the United States under the provisions of section 401 (c) of this act, shall be entitled to the benefits of the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, except that contained in subdivision (2) thereof. Such person, if abroad, may enter the United States as a nonquota immigrant, for the purpose of recovering his citizenship, upon compliance with the provisions of the Immigration Acts of 1917 and 1924.

Of course, the language of the proposed amendment, no doubt, has been well prepared, but it is meaningless in itself and I would like to ask someone to explain to me just what that amendment does.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] as he was chairman of the subcommittee that worked on these amendments.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Ohio. Reading the amendment by itself, it is not exactly meaningless, but it is certainly quite difficult to explain. Any amendment read separately from a bill is difficult to understand. Of course, the gentleman has read the bill and the amendments to it and I will be

pleased to explain this particular amendment to the gentleman from Ohio, who has always given these problems his careful and earnest study. He is well informed on problems of immigration and naturalization.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I will be glad if the gentleman will do that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Under the original House bill it was provided that anyone who joined a foreign army would lose his citizenship whether he took an oath of allegiance to the country of that army or not. You know until recently it was generally understood that if you joined a foreign army you took an oath of allegiance to the country of the army that you joined, but in recent years there have been a good many cases, and I believe right now more of it is being done, where men join foreign armies and do not take the oath of allegiance. The provision in the bill that was passed by the House said, in substance, that anyone who joined a foreign army would lose his citizenship. We found it to be true, however, that an American citizen would join the army, we will say, of Great Britain, and thereby lost his citizenship he might become stateless unless he could become a citizen of Great Britain. Furthermore, we just do not want that sort of thing to happen and therefore the bill has been amended in the Senate to say, in substance, that anyone who is a citizen or national of the United States and joins the army of a country in which he has dual citizenship, that person will lose his citizenship in the United States.

I might go back and explain a little further that the reason for this particular amendment comes about largely because it is said that there are persons from certain countries who have gone to the United States or its possessions and have children born here or in our possessions that returned to the country of their parents and acquired dual citizenship of such country. They join the army of that country without taking the oath. They have returned to this country and we are never able to tell whether they have been in those armies or not. We would like to find out the facts if we can. So we are cutting their citizenship off except under certain circumstances and conditions.

Now, all in the world we are saying here is, in substance, that if a person has a dual citizenship in a country where he joined the army he loses his citizenship but if he is an American citizen without dual citizenship and has joined a foreign army without taking the oath, he does not lose his citizenship. Then to go one step further, if he joins the army of a country where he has dual citizenship he may return to this country and file application for the recovery of his citizenship, practically in the same manner as veterans have done under the laws that were passed in 1917.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Let us take the case of a boy who goes to some foreign country and joins its army. When the war is over or any time he wants to come back, this amendment provides that he may come back as a nonquota immigrant. He works his way back to citizenship according to law.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If he has not taken the oath of the country whose army he joined.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Oh, yes; of course, if he has expatriated himself, has held up his hand and said, in effect, "I am not a citizen of the United States any more," and accepted the citizenship of some other country, then, of course, he is not any longer entitled to our compassion.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. But if he is a boy who has run away and joined the army just out of the lure of what the army offers, and so on, we do not want to punish him by keeping him out, and that is a very laudable provision in the bill. But in section 2 it says "except that contained in subdivision (2) thereof." What is subsection 2 and what has subsection 2 got to do with it? If it is a boy such as I have described, there is no impediment to his return.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. But what is this subsection 2? What kind of a predicament can he get himself into that would keep him out except renouncing allegiance to the

United States and assuming allegiance to some other country? What is in this section? I have it before me, but I cannot tell what it means.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Subsection 2 says that a person who has acquired nationality through his parents—that is to say, if he acquires that nationality because of his parents, not of his own volition—

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Well, let me ask you this in a broad sense: For instance, here is a man who has been in this country. He is of foreign extraction. He, of course, would not be a citizen until he becomes a citizen, but he has been in the country and he has been a law-abiding citizen, but he goes back and joins the army in his own country. He has already indicated his willingness to become a citizen. I presume section 2 means that if he goes back to his native country and becomes married, and so on, and becomes entangled in some domestic connection he will not be able to get back as freely as the boy that I first described?

Mr. REES of Kansas. He certainly would not.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I presume that is what section 2 means.

Mr. REES of Kansas. He never was able to.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I think that is what No. 2 in this fourth amendment means. It means that if a boy wants to come back, then we are going to let him come back, but if he has mixed himself up in something else that disqualifies him, he has to prove himself clear and fight himself back as best he can. I do not profess to understand this fully. My only interest is to feel that you have not let something slip into this law that will cause us trouble.

Now, let me go to amendment No. 5. That is a very long amendment and is very complicated. I have read it with a great deal of care. I must confess I do not understand it exactly. Let me ask if this is what it means: The gentleman appreciates this fact, that we have always maintained in the United States—and, by the way, our country was the first country to lay down real, sensible immigration laws.

In other words, we laid down the foundation. They have all followed us. Some have gone a great deal further than we have, but we have had a principle of law that we have not lost sight of, and that is that an alien who has not yet arrived in our country has no rights under our law; not a single right does he possess. When he comes here he has practically all the civil rights that a citizen has. He has a right to park his car within the white lines. If he has children he has the right to send them to our schools. When he comes here he has the same rights, but until he comes here he has none. I hope this section does not invade this time-honored principle that we have defended so nobly in this country.

Mr. LESINSKI. That amendment is for this purpose: Where our manufacturers send agents through the country and they may have to remain 5, 10, or 15 years in a foreign country, we have to give them certain rights to come back.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. But I would like to address myself to this one theme that I have laid down: Does this invade that time-honored position that we have taken in this country and always defended successfully?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It does not have a thing to do with it. I think the gentleman is talking about the amendment that has to do with the question of what we regard a right to a day in court."

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is what I mean exactly.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think the gentleman recalls that when this measure was explained before the House we have amended the code to tighten the situation a great deal with reference to individuals who have what we call dual citizenship. There are thousands of persons abroad who have what is known as dual citizenship. Let me give you an example. For instance, take a man who is born abroad of American citizen parents. That particular person born abroad, born in Italy or Germany or France or whatever it may be, if his parents are American citizens he is an American citizen because he is the child of American citizens.

Then he acquires citizenship of the country where he is born. We have provided among other things in this code

that that particular group of persons will lose their citizenship under certain circumstances and conditions.

This particular provision applies now only to persons who are nationals or citizens. We have discussed the question of what we mean by "nationals."

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. What do you mean by "nationals"?

Mr. REES of Kansas. They are persons who owe allegiance to the Government of the United States. We say that if those persons attempt to come back, if they are turned down by the diplomatic representatives of our country abroad, if they still are able to give a substantial reason why they should be admitted as citizens of the United States, and if the Department of State believes there is a substantial reason for doing so, that person may come to this country for the purpose of bringing an action in court and being heard in this court and having his case appealed if he wants to. At the same time it is with the understanding that if he is turned down he shall be deported from this country.

We have a rather new situation here, and that is we are cutting off the claim to citizenship of these thousands of persons under this provision in the bill who do not comply with its terms and therefore it was deemed advisable that some chance be given them to have what might be called their day in court. We have safeguarded the situation extremely carefully and feel that so far as possible we have prevented any abuse of it. It was my contention when this measure was up for consideration in the committee that such people did have the right to go into court either on a declaratory judgment or under a writ of habeas corpus, but there was a feeling on the part of others that they may not have that right.

We are giving this right not to aliens, if you please, but to American citizens. There being perhaps some foundation for that contention, we have allowed it but have safeguarded it just as carefully as we could. Have I made myself clear to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I think this proposition is pretty well laid down. It is unfortunate that the amendment that is going to be written into the bill is not the amendment the gentleman gave me and the one I am reading from.

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman will find that in amendment No. 1, the word "alien" was put in. In other words, an alien cannot take an appeal.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I think that was a very salutary change and protection, but I want to develop this somewhat further. I remember a case that came to the attention of Congress, the case of a man attempting to avoid the principle I talked about a while ago. He had married a woman who lived in Germany, and before he married her he had been informed that she could not be admitted into this country. He tried to bring a suit, in fact did bring a mandamus action against the Secretary of State to compel the admission of this woman into the United States. The case went to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court held just as I said a while ago that an alien outside of the United States not a citizen of the United States, one who has not started to become naturalized, would have no right in our courts.

I think the provision in the amendments defining the word "national" is a very salutary one.

I know there are a lot of fine people who need the protection of this provision that I am discussing. There is no question about that, but what I am concerned about, and this is the next question, is that when we come close to a fundamental principle of law which we have agreed upon for years we must be exceedingly cautious. What you are saying here is that a man who has never been in the United States at all—

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Let me proceed for a minute, please. What you are saying in this amendment is that a man who has never been in the United States at all but who claims he is a national either because his parents were, or on some other ground but is not, in fact, a national, can make application in

our courts to have tested the question of whether he is a national. Or suppose he wants to be admitted into this country to do something not for the best interests of the country, he can claim his day in court.

Certainly we should not protect him as we would the boy who became a soldier. What is there in the bill to prevent the abuse of this privilege by a man who puts up a plausible claim to being what he in fact is not? The gentleman from Kansas has done a splendid job on this bill and I compliment him; he deserves to be complimented. Likewise the gentleman from Michigan, he has done a splendid job and I compliment him; but I do not want to see us give imposters a right to carry on their perfidy while we are trying to do something worth while for some deserving people.

Mr. LESINSKI. I return the compliment to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. But I want to know what safeguards have been erected against the abuse of this privilege.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think I can answer the gentleman briefly. Let me call his attention to the fact that he seems to be discussing aliens. We are not talking about aliens.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I am afraid the gentleman is wrong about that. I am talking about the case of a man who is not a national but who claims to be a national and who makes a showing of establishing that he is a national of this country. What have you in the bill to put up the bars against such a fellow?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman from Ohio being familiar with these nationality laws knows that anyone who is a citizen who goes abroad can come back into the United States any time he wants to no matter what he has done while abroad just so he has not done one thing, lose his citizenship.

He may even have committed a crime, just so he has not in some way expatriated himself as a citizen of this country. That is the present law. He does not have to bother about this process. He can come back to the United States and claim the protection of the laws here or the protection of our Government while abroad. Under this code we have provided certain restrictions in that situation and one of the most important is that the man who claims dual citizenship and who does not make the claim within a 2-year and 90-day period after this bill becomes law, that person has the burden of proof. Heretofore there was no burden at all. Now he loses his citizenship if he does not come into the United States within 2 years after this bill passes and maintain that citizenship. He is out otherwise. Except also he has 2 years after he reaches the age of 21.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. We are not very far apart on this. Let us get back to this hypothetical case of the man in Germany. He has never been over here, he has never had the benefit of the teachings of Americanism. Let us assume he is a Nazi. He does not espouse our theories at all. But he has a pretty good claim that he is an American national. He can make out a pretty good claim that he is a national. Now all he has to do is step up to a consul and say, "I am an American national and I want you to give me a certificate," and the consul has to give it to him. If you interpret this law liberally he may have to give him that certificate. Then he can go over all Germany and say, "I am a German" when he wants to be a German and "I am an American" when he wants to be an American. And if he refuses to give him that certificate, that man may institute an action in our courts to have court take the time to hear his case.

This law goes too far in that respect. This fellow has the right to file a petition in the United States courts. We used to say that these fellows who are away from here have no right in our courts. But here is a man who has never been here and he has the right to file a petition in the United States court demanding a certificate that he is an American national, and he may use it.

Of course, you have one very fine provision in here and I compliment you for that. If the consul over there is on to his job he can make that fellow prove all these things before he gives him a certificate, but if he is inclined to be loose he may say, "We will let him go through. He

claims he is a national, and we will give him a certificate." Then that fellow will parade himself as an American citizen. I know you have tried to shut the door. Now, I ask you this question in the spirit of an American, like all of us here are: Can I go out of this room after this is adopted and tell the people who are going to ask about this law that we have shut the door against that fellow? Do you make him establish the fact he is a national and that he is what he claims to be before he can masquerade all over Europe with a certificate from an American consul saying that he is something which he is not? What I want you to know is that if you have failed to do this you have overlooked an important matter. We should make our immigration laws fair toward the man or woman who is deserving, but we cannot be too strict toward the imposters and those who would undermine our Government and its institutions. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to prolong this discussion further.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Under the present law the individual the gentleman from Ohio is talking about does not have to go through any process at all. If he is still a citizen of the United States, even though born abroad, he does not have to go through any process at all. In this act we put the burden of proof upon that individual to show that he is a citizen or a national of the United States. Along with that, we have guarded the thing further. After placing the power and authority in the hands of the State Department, we give him, as I tried to explain a few minutes ago, a day in court. The other way he can come back into the United States, regardless of what we may say about it, because he is still a citizen and entitled to our protection, no matter how long he may have been abroad.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to ask a question about a person born in the United States of foreign parentage—that is, of noncitizen parentage—and who has this status of dual nationality. Suppose he is called back to join the army of the country of his parents, which he does. I understand that after his service he can apply for reentry to the United States under this act.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If he goes back to that army and joins without taking the oath, then he can come back to this country and petition for citizenship and have a hearing. If he has taken the oath of the foreign country he loses his citizenship and becomes an alien.

Mr. LESINSKI. There is an additional explanation. The law provides that any man who reaches the age of 21 must make his declaration within 2 years after his twenty-first birthday or he loses all his rights to American citizenship.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does this law provide that he cannot hold dual citizenship?

Mr. LESINSKI. This law provides he must make his declaration within 2 years and 9 months after his twenty-first birthday.

Mr. HINSHAW. There is one country in the Orient which says that if the parent of a child registers its nationality and citizenship with that foreign country before the child reaches 16 months of age, the citizenship is permanent.

Mr. LESINSKI. What foreign country?

Mr. HINSHAW. That does not make any difference.

Mr. LESINSKI. Suppose American-born children went back to Europe and settled there with their parents. Those are what we call dual citizens, or they hold dual citizenship. Now when those persons reach the age of 21 they must make a declaration upon attaining the age of 21 years and if they do not they lose all rights to American citizenship.

Mr. HINSHAW. Let us get down to cases and speak of the Japanese child born in the United States of Japanese parentage and who is registered with Japan as a citizen of Japan before he reaches the age of 16 months.

Mr. LESINSKI. Of course, our law is very plain on that. Everybody born here is an American citizen.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand, but they are registered in their home country as Japanese citizens.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KRAMER].

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the amendments that was written into this bill by the Senate was to give the right of citizenship to Filipinos who are in the Government service. The House conferees voted against that amendment, likewise did two of the Senate conferees, so the Senate receded from that amendment and it was stricken out. We felt that it was giving special privilege to one race, whereas there were many other people coming from other countries, such as Ireland, Sweden, and Poland, who were likewise in the civil service, and why should we give a special privilege to the Filipinos on the Pacific coast or elsewhere and not to the others. If they were losing their jobs by this legislation it is through the fault of no one but themselves because they were all the time holding themselves out as being American citizens.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to put a few questions to the gentleman in charge of the bill, and particularly to the chairman of the subcommittee, who I feel sure is an eminent lawyer and constitutional authority. I was very much interested in the questions raised by the gentleman from Ohio which had to do with some of these complicated matters. In these days when we have so much discussion about and so much thought in the public mind concerning dangerous aliens and subversive influences, I am wondering what rights resident aliens have under the Constitution of the United States. I have heard it said that they have no rights guaranteed by the Constitution. Would the gentleman from Kansas comment on that question a bit? For instance, does the right to have a writ of habeas corpus, the right of judicial trial, the protection of due process of law, and other such rights apply with equal force to resident aliens as to citizens of the United States?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's compliment about my being a constitutional lawyer, but I am afraid if I went into too broad a discussion of the question he might discover that I am not as well qualified as a constitutional lawyer as he suggests. Nevertheless, I believe I can answer his question rather definitely and say that if this country sees fit to admit an alien to this country he is entitled to all the protection that is provided our own citizens under the law. I am speaking about the protection afforded under our Constitution. Of course, he does not have the right to vote or the right to hold office. Under our present laws we provide that aliens may not be employed by the various departments of the Government. However, the gentleman is talking about the Constitution.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I believe that what the gentleman means is that, as we all know, an alien who is in this country has all the rights of personal liberty that a citizen has.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right. I appreciate the statement of the distinguished floor leader.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. The Bill of Rights applies to that resident alien the same as to an American citizen?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I thank the gentleman for the information and it confirms my thought on the matter.

As one who is a long way removed from his ancestors who came from Europe to American shores, I may be exhibiting that common American characteristic of the older inhabitants by wishing to tighten our immigration laws and deal more firmly with the aliens who have come among us. Yet I do appreciate the splendid human contribution which America has continually received from abroad. I am confident that love of America burns as fiercely or even more fiercely in the breasts of many newcomers than it burns in the breasts of some natural-born Americans or those who have descended from natural-born Americans. While all that is true, we must recognize that there are dangerous aliens among us. Even discounting some of the fears and the exaggerations of alarmists about "fifth columnists," prudence dictates that we reshape our laws concerning immigrants and concerning

the taking out of American citizenship and concerning the treatment of resident aliens in this country.

Now that the Old World is on fire, and there will be effort made by many nationals of warring countries to escape Old World troubles and get to America, there is especial need of vigilance on our part to be more selective and to debar the dangerous and undesirable variety and deport that variety who are already here. American citizenship must mean something. It does mean very much, and it must not be too freely bestowed upon the unworthy. Those of us who have read sacred history remember how a great but despised early Christian frequently avoided persecution and escaped imprisonment merely by pronouncing the magic words, "I am a Roman citizen." Would to God every worthy person within the confines of our country might put greater meaning into similar words by proudly affirming, "I am an American citizen." Such would afford him all the rights, benefits, privileges, and blessings of our Bill of Rights and of the entire Constitution of the United States.

I have no patience with aliens who come to our shores, or who have years ago come to our shores, for selfish reasons, have lived here for years without attempting to become naturalized citizens. I have no plea nor excuse for them, and have never asked any special consideration of them. Of course, I am very well aware that there are many resident aliens in this country who have not become citizens, and who would like very much to become citizens, being prevented by some explainable matter from doing so. I have pity rather than censure for such aliens residing among us if their loyalty and attitude in other respects may be approved.

During recent weeks a sort of war-time hysteria has swept this country, and some professed patriotic leaders have demanded deportation of all alien troublemakers—as if we were not all anxious to do just that. They have been impatient of delay and careless about method. These would-be political figures sometimes assert that aliens residing in this country have no rights at all under the Constitution, and that they should be deported merely on the ground that they are charged with being hurtful.

It is my understanding that the entrance of a foreigner into this country is not a right of his but a privilege which our Government may grant or withhold, but when an alien has entered this country legally—or at least not illegally—and has resided here, that his status ripens into a right to the protection of our Constitution exactly as the Constitution and Bill of Rights protect American citizens. I further understand that the Supreme Court of the United States has declared that the writ of habeas corpus applies to an alien in this country exactly as to an American citizen, and that the right of judicial trial according to due process of law is guaranteed by the Constitution itself to aliens and nationals of other countries living in this country. Of course, some of these benefits to resident aliens may be further strengthened by treaty provisions between our Government and the governments of which they are subjects. Naturally such treaty provisions, according to the Constitution, become a part of the Constitution itself.

There certainly has been need, in recent months, for new legislation concerning immigrants and aliens, and Congress has passed quite a body of laws besides this measure before us today dealing with the subject. This legislative process has been going on for more than a year. On the 28th of June last, a comprehensive measure finally became law providing for the registration of aliens and also providing for deportation of certain classes of dangerous and undesirable aliens. I recall that the House bills which constituted the initial form of this recent legislation passed the House in May 1939, and I recall that the conference report on some of this legislation came before the House on June 22 this year. Apparently it takes considerable time to affect final enactment of these much needed measures. However, I do believe that this Congress, with new legislation and with codification of old legislation, has dealt energetically, and I hope effectively and fairly, with the problem of the aliens who live among us or who wish to come to live among us. I trust that this will

emphasize the value of American citizenship in all minds and will duly safeguard the precious thing called the American way of life.

Such legislation is a complicated matter, and although I have not been able to look through this bill very carefully, I want to compliment the committee on what they have done. I hope it will clear up many of the questions which are puzzling us. Acting within the framework of constitutional principles and with patriotic loyalty, we need to draw the line sharply so as to deal justly with the three and one-half million or more aliens who are among us, and at the same time protect the great American heritage for our own children as well as for those who have come as our guests from other lands, later to become citizens. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I want to go on with the question I was asking a moment ago about the child with dual citizenship who grows up here and is called back to serve in the Army of the country of his other citizenship, and then applies for reentry to the United States. The gentleman from Kansas said that at the age of 21 years plus 2 years and 90 days, I believe it was, he had to make a declaration of his determination of citizenship, but suppose the foreign country which has his other citizenship refuses to release him from that nationality. He might serve in that army and he might serve in a war against the United States. Is he still eligible to return to the United States? I mean, he might serve in the foreign army without taking the oath of allegiance, because of the feeling that he is already a citizen.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman now is talking about this man's becoming an enemy of this country.

Mr. HINSHAW. He might have served in a foreign army, and that army might have operated against the United States.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Let us divide the question. If an individual is born in the United States and joins the army without taking an oath of allegiance of the country of his dual citizenship, that is, he is born here of foreign parentage and as a child is taken by his parents to the country from which his parents came, and becomes a citizen of that country because of the parentage of his father and mother or his father or mother, as the case may be—that person would lose his citizenship.

Mr. HINSHAW. I brought up a moment ago the case where the child was registered with the consul before the age of 16 months, and consequently they claim him as a citizen.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am not sure that we would pay any particular attention to his registry. We would follow the law of our own country.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes; but they claim him as a citizen because his parents, before the age of 16 months, registered him as a citizen of that foreign country.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman is suggesting a matter, I believe, that would have to be ironed out by the State Department. Let us get back to the simple question of an individual born here who acquires dual citizenship. We would follow the laws of our country and not the laws of any other country. If the parents go back to their home country and acquire citizenship in that country also, then that individual if he fights in the army of that particular country can only reacquire his citizenship by filing a petition in the courts of this country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] was temporarily called from the Chamber, and asked me to request unanimous consent that he be given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on the first legislative day of next week I may be permitted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to insert an article regarding the commercial and industrial depression in the Northwest and in other sections of the Nation, and the bearing which our transportation facilities have on the same, and also to include an article by William A. Marin, of Minnesota, an expert on rate problems. The matter, Mr. Speaker, is over the limit allowed, but I have taken it up with the Committee on Printing and have also obtained an estimate from the Public Printer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what he knows about the program for next week, because that will save a lot of questions if it is in the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday, of course, we have the Consent Calendar and the conference report on the rivers and harbors bill and there may be one or two suspensions.

Mr. MICHENER. The Ramspeck bill will not be taken up?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I understand the Ramspeck bill will be called up, and I am glad the gentleman has called that to my attention.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is that coming up definitely?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my understanding; yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 162. An act to protect producers, manufacturers, distributors, and consumers from the unrevealed presence of substitutes and mixtures in spun, woven, knitted, felted, or otherwise manufactured wool products, and for other purposes;

S. 3437. An act for the relief of the France-American Construction Co.;

S. 3778. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," approved June 26, 1930;

S. 3920. An act to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, as amended June 20, 1939, and for other purposes;

S. 4316. An act to repeal sections 4588 and 4591 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

S. 4341. An act to expedite national defense by suspending, during the national emergency, provisions of law that prohibit more than 8 hours' labor in any one day of persons engaged upon work covered by contracts of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 295. Joint resolution authorizing the participation of the United States in the celebration of a Pan American Aviation Day, to be observed on December 17 of each year, the anniversary of the first successful flight of a heavier-than-air machine.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On October 3, 1940:

H. R. 1999. An act to confer jurisdiction upon certain United States commissioners to try petty offenses committed on Federal reservations;

H. R. 2728. An act to add certain lands to the Cleveland National Forest in Orange County, Calif.;

H. R. 3009. An act for the relief of June Thompson, a minor;

H. R. 3481. An act for the relief of C. Z. Bush and W. D. Kennedy;

H. R. 4066. An act for the relief of Josefina Alvarado;

H. R. 4126. An act for the relief of Warren Zimmerman;

H. R. 4615. An act for the relief of Sallie Barr;

H. R. 4656. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Esther Klein;

H. R. 4724. An act for the relief of Charles F. Martin, a minor;

H. R. 4815. An act for the relief of Henry J. Wise;

H. R. 5040. An act for the relief of Arthur Joseph Reiber, a minor;

H. R. 5314. An act for the relief of Paul J. Kokanik;

H. R. 5814. An act for the relief of David J. Williams, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 6215. An act for the relief of John E. Avery;

H. R. 6512. An act for the relief of F. W. Heaton;

H. R. 6687. An act to permit the States to extend their sales, use, and income taxes to persons residing or carrying on business, or to transactions occurring in Federal areas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6820. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hama Torii Emerson;

H. R. 6888. An act for the relief of Esther Jacobs;

H. R. 7139. An act for the relief of Joe L. McQueen;

H. R. 7276. An act for the relief of Walter B. McDougall and Herbert Maier;

H. R. 7302. An act for the relief of Lillian Brown and Silas Young;

H. R. 7357. An act to amend section 4472 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 46, sec. 465) to provide for the safe carriage of explosives or other dangerous or semi-dangerous articles or substances on board vessels; to make more effective the provisions of the International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea, 1929, relating to the carriage of dangerous goods, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7731. An act to provide for the burial and funeral expenses of deceased veterans of the Regular Establishment who were discharged for disability incurred in the service in line of duty, or in receipt of pension for service-connected disability;

H. R. 7815. An act for the relief of Boston & Maine Railroad;

H. R. 7910. An act for the relief of Betty Jane Bear Robe;

H. R. 8069. An act to re-form the lease for the Sellwood station of the Portland (Oreg.) post office;

H. R. 8150. An act providing for the barring of claims against the United States;

H. R. 8163. An act for the relief of Antonio Sabatini;

H. R. 8301. An act for the relief of Allen B. Boyer;

H. R. 8369. An act authorizing a per capita payment of \$10 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from any funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to their credit;

H. R. 8744. An act for the relief of Ernst Lyle Greenwood and Phyllis Joy Greenwood;

H. R. 8868. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Bolinross Co., Inc.;

H. R. 9073. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain officers and men of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the value of personal effects lost, damaged, or destroyed in a fire aboard the Coast and Geodetic Survey launch *Mikawe* at Norfolk, Va., on October 27, 1939;

H. R. 9284. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice the healing art in the District of Columbia to Dr. A. L. Ridings;

H. R. 9561. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Minnesota Department of Highways and the counties of Benton and Stearns in Minnesota, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn.;

H. R. 9656. An act to authorize the acceptance of donations of property for the Vicksburg National Military Park, in the State of Mississippi, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9670. An act to provide an 8-hour workday and payment for overtime for dispatchers and mechanics-in-charge in the motor-vehicle service of the Postal Service;

H. R. 9722. An act to provide for the regulation of the business of fire, marine, and casualty insurance, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9734. An act authorizing allocation of funds for the construction of Saco Divide unit, Milk River project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9736. An act to amend section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize the Attorney General to approve the title to low-value lands and interests in lands acquired by or on behalf of the United States subject to infirmities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9840. An act for the relief of Bela Karlovitz;

H. R. 9921. An act to authorize the maintenance and operation of fish hatcheries in connection with the Grand Coulee Dam project;

H. R. 9942. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Henry W. Shurlds and W. H. White a patent to certain lands in the State of Mississippi;

H. R. 9943. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Ruth Gainey Branscome a patent to certain lands in the State of Mississippi;

H. R. 9952. An act authorizing the Indiana State Toll Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Wabash River at or near Mount Vernon, Posey County, Ind.;

H. R. 9989. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain land to the city of Memphis, Tenn., for street-widening purposes;

H. R. 9991. An act to amend section 4021 of the Revised Statutes and to repeal section 4023 of the Revised Statutes relating to establishment of postal agencies;

H. R. 10061. An act to consolidate certain exceptions to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and to improve the United States Code;

H. R. 10155. An act for the relief of William M. Irvine;

H. R. 10246. An act to further amend the act of July 30, 1937, authorizing the conveyance of a portion of the Stony Point Light Station Reservation to the Palisades Interstate Park Commission;

H. R. 10267. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in a small strip of land at Veterans' Administration facility, Los Angeles, Calif., to the county of Los Angeles, Calif., for sidewalk purposes;

H. R. 10337. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to order retired commissioned and warrant officers of the Coast Guard to active duty during time of national emergency, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10406. An act to authorize the appointment of graduates of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps to the line of the Regular Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10413. An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 467. Joint resolution to exempt from the tax on admissions amounts paid for admission tickets sold by authority of the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1941; and

H. J. Res. 603. Joint resolution to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to furnish to the State of

Pennsylvania a vessel suitable for the use of the Pennsylvania State Nautical School, and for other purposes.

On October 4, 1940:

H. R. 4088. An act to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, to extend its provisions to fats and oils, cottonseed, cottonseed meal, and peanuts;

H. R. 8846. An act to provide for the retirement of certain members of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 9581. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, as amended; and

H. R. 10339. An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, in accordance with its previous order, until Monday, October 7, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1982. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a complete set of laws passed by the municipal councils and the legislative assembly of the Virgin Islands during the fiscal year 1940 (H. Doc. No. 963); to the Committee on Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 10539. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the support of the Government for fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 3016). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 9980. A bill to revise and codify the nationality laws of the United States (Rept. No. 3019). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 3133. An act for the relief of the Cherokee Indian Nation or Tribe, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 3020). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 1432. An act authorizing the Snake or Piute Indians of the former Malheur Indian Reservation of Oregon to sue in the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 3022). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Texas: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 7813. A bill to safeguard the homing pigeon; without amendment (Rept. No. 3023). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. VAN ZANDT: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 10063. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Ona Lovcikiene and children, Edmundos and Regina; without amendment (Rept. No. 3017). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. AUSTIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 10282. A bill for the relief of Karel Lederer; without amendment (Rept. No. 3018). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 4212. An act for the relief of certain Navajo Indians, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 3021). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 10611. A bill to provide for the completion of alterations to bridge over the Columbia River at Hood River, Oreg., and White Salmon, Wash., resulting from the construction of Bonneville Dam; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOOK:

H. R. 10612. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Sturgeon River and its tributaries in the State of Michigan for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 10613. A bill to authorize procurement of certain products made by the blind in Alaska, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin:

H. R. 10614. A bill to permit disclosure of information to claimants of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. HARTER of Ohio:

H. R. 10615. A bill to provide for reimbursing Portage County, Ohio, for loss of certain taxes by reason of acquisition of land by the United States for the shell-loading plant near Ravenna, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H. J. Res. 610. Joint resolution: Prepare for Peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. J. Res. 611. Joint resolution to provide for the cooperation of the United States of America in the plans of the St. Augustine historical program for the establishment of a permanent inter-American cultural center in St. Augustine, Fla.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 10616. A bill for the relief of William H. Evens; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MACIEJEWSKI:

H. R. 10617. A bill for the relief of Jan Jindrich Reiner; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 10618. A bill for the relief of Antomin Stepan Reiner; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

9342. By Mr. CARTER: Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Alameda, State of California, protesting against action on House bill 10384 and Senate bill 4269, amending the Social Security Act by reducing period of residence in States from 5 years to 1 year to receive old-age-security payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9343. By Mr. HART: Petition of the Board of Education of the City of Jersey City, N. J., urging the continuance and expansion of Federal reimbursement to public vocational schools; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9344. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of the Educational Council of the National Public Housing Conference, New York, N. Y., urging enactment of Senate bill 591, for additional slum clearance and low-rent housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.